. . . THE . . .

CHURCH OF CHRIST

IDENTIFIED

BY HER

OBEDIENCE.

M
230.97R2
L52ch

C/97

Mennonite Historical Library
Goshen College - Goshen, Indiana

THE

CHURCH OF CHRIST IDENTIFIED

. . . BY HER OBEDIENCE TO . . .

Scriptural Teaching and Practice,

NON-RESISTANCE OF EVIL,

Proper Observance of Ordinances,

AND

Separation from all Unfaithful Worship.

BY

JACOB S. LEHMAN.

HAGERSTOWN, MD.:
PRINTED BY THE MAIL PUBLISHING CO.
1897.

GOSHEN COLLEGE LIBRARY GOSHEN, INDIANA

Mennonite Historical Library
Goshen College - Goshen, Indiana

~~M~~
~~230 R2~~
~~L 52 c~~
26379.

MJ
230.97R2
L52ch

DENISON COLLEGE LIBRARY
GRANVILLE, OHIO

PREFACE.

In undertaking to write upon a subject of such importance as that of the Church of Christ and its obvious characteristics, such as a faithful adherence to the commandments and ordinances, and to the usages of Christ and his Apostles, which serve as marks and signs by which the church at all times can be identified, I feel my inability to do the subject justice. At the same time, having given the subject many years of serious consideration, and being deeply impressed that much error prevails upon the subject, even among many apparently well-disposed and sincere persons, I have endeavored through these pages to make known certain facts; trusting they will be the means of bringing the light of truth to those of our friends who will consider them fairly, and treat them with that consideration which truth merits. The literary character of this tract will not bear the criticism of the learned. It makes no claim to literary merit. It is the sole purpose of the author to present the requirements of the New Testament in a plain manner, so as to be intelligible to all. Recognizing the importance of a knowledge of the doctrine of Christ, and of the salvation of the soul, we earnestly ask a careful reading of this little work. If it should, under the blessing of God, be the means of aiding one soul to a clearer conception of Christian duty, the labor of the writer will be well repaid, and the Lord shall have the praise.

APRIL, 1897. THE AUTHOR.

UNITY, A MARK OF IDENTITY.

The Church Established by Christ.

THE mission of Jesus Christ upon earth was to save sinners by fulfilling the law, atoning for sin by his death upon the cross, and by his triumphant resurrection from the dead and ascension to the right hand of the Father. He also revealed the Father's will by teaching a doctrine, the principle of which is love; and as the principle is an unchanging one, so the doctrine is also immutable. For the preservation and perpetuity of the doctrine, Christ established the Church. To this end, during his public ministry, he chose the twelve Apostles, to whom he declared his doctrine, and whom he commissioned to publish the same, and to organize his church. They were given authority to appoint co-laborers and successors for the preaching and spreading of his word, and for the continuation of the church, with the promise of his unerring spirit to guide them into all truth. They were to teach and preach the Gospel of Christ, the same doctrine that he taught them. He gave them a sure word of promise, saying, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world;" and also, "The gates of Hell shall not prevail against it." Thus we have full assurance that his church shall prevail, and shall continue unchanged in its doctrines and ordinances; for it is built upon the word of Eternal

Truth, which will abide after heaven and earth have passed away, and has the promise of the over-shadowing presence and guidance of that "God that changeth not."

Material of Which the Church is Built.

Christ, the author and founder of the church, taught human depravity, the unsaved state of man, and the necessity of repentance and reformation of life. He also taught the necessity of faith, and of the restoration of the divine life to the soul. The necessity of the latter qualification is forcibly expressed in the following words of our Savior to Nicodemus: "Marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must be born again." (John 3:7.)

The effect of this new birth, or regeneration in believers is a similarity in sentiment and desire, which is wrought by the devine Spirit upon such souls as have attained to a knowledge of their lost and helpless state, and through repentance and a desire for salvation, have by faith applied to the source of all comfort, and obtained pardon of their sins.

Since Christ's church is the "ground and pillar of the truth," and is designed as an ark of safety for redeemed souls, he has given *marks or signs* by which she may be known.

The Church of Christ Must be One.

Christ's language is unmistakable; "Upon this rock," as upon a sure foundation, "I will build my *church*," not *churches*. According to the language of Christ, there can be but one true church. He founded but one, and

authorized none other. The fact that there are many professed churches of Christ, does not invalidate, nor change, the express declaration of Christ, when he says, *church*, and not *churches*. As the disciples were commanded to teach all he had taught them ; they undoubtedly advocated and impressed upon their hearers the doctrine of unity. Their successors having the same divine spirit to guide them, did teach the same and always will continue to do so. Since the doctrine of Christ does not change, the church will have the same spirit and doctrine now, and until the end of time, that she had when first organized. We find in John 10:16, "And other sheep I have, that are not of this fold ; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice ; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." Christ speaks of *one fold*, not of *folds*. It is plain from his language, as given above, that all who hear his voice will be made one fold ; and there will then be but *one* fold, and *one* Shepherd. There is here no recognition of sects. The meaning of the language is so evident, that it leaves no room for any doubt as to the unity that must exist in Christ's church. Let us now hear the prayer of Jesus Christ : "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word ; that they all may be one ; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us ; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them ; that they may be one, even as

we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one." (John 17:20-23.) In this prayer Christ makes it clear that there should be unity in his church. If all who profess the religion of Christ were of the same mind, spiritually, there could be no divisions. The many divisions of the present time are the result of disagreement in doctrine; and could not exist if all who profess love to Christ had the mind of Christ. There is evidently something wrong when such divisions prevail; and they are strong evidence of the absence of the principles of spiritual life, which is love.

The Vine—A Representation of Unity.

"I am the vine, ye are the branches. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me."—(John 15:4, 5. In this parable Christ plainly and unmistakably teaches unity. Every believer is a branch in the Vine, which is Christ, and is a member of his body; and as the branches of the natural vine partake of the nature of the vine, being nourished by it, so also every true believer is by faith united to Christ, having the spirit and life of Christ. Since there is similarity between the natural vine and its branches; and as the natural vine and its branches are used as a figure of Christ and his church, it is conclusive that there is agreement and accord between all who are united to Christ by faith, and who thereby have the divine life. Having the spirit and life of Christ, they also have unity; for the kingdom which Christ secured for his

people consists of peace, joy, and righteousness in the Holy Ghost. It is claimed by many well disposed persons, that the different organizations, called churches, are branches in the true Vine. If this be true, why are they not united? Why are they not joined together in the same judgment? Why are they not teaching the same doctrine? That they disagree is evident from the fact that they are not united. It will not avail to say, they only differ in non-essentials, There is a manifest lack of sincerity in this popular and very deceptive theory. To divide on non-essentials is at variance with the spirit and letter of the gospel; and their very position and worship contradict such claim. Divisions are opposed to the divine economy, as evinced by the teaching and practice of the Apostles; and by the manifestation of the divine will upon the day of Pentecost. How utterly untenable therefore the claim, that divisions are justifiable, because of differences that do not amount to anything. The popular claim to unity will not stand the test of Matt. 18: 15 —— 17. "Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican."

All the redeemed of the Lord love each other, and therefore do not suffer sin to remain upon any member of the fold. The life-giving principle of love influences them to act in harmony with the command of love, to the extent that if brethren err, they will tell them of their fault with the view of gaining them. If they fail to gain them by simply calling their attention to the failing, they will continue their labor according to the command. If they fail to gain them by further effort, they will be referred to the judgment of the church; and if they reject the counsel of the church, they will be separated as unfaithful members. The above named duty devolves upon every member of the church of Christ. The command is based upon love, and is designed for the promotion of peace and harmony. The command is plain and specific, and indispensable to the unity of the church. There is divine goodness and wisdom displayed in the command, "Tell him his fault between thee and him alone." No third person is included. "If he shall hear thee thou hast gained thy brother." The motive is love, the object is to gain the brother,—to reclaim the erring. No other motive is admissible. It is not because the brother has wounded our feelings, or because he has not treated us brotherly; it is solely to gain him. In the second act, "If he hear thee not, take one or two more with thee"; none besides these need know it. If he is gained by the second effort, all is well and the matter is not spread. The third act, "If he hear not these tell it unto the

church," is the last effort; and if it succeeds, he is gained; a multitude of sins are covered, and a soul saved from destruction. But if he refuses the counsel of the church, he merits excommunication.

We are prompted by love to appeal to the convictions of the ministers and members of the different religious organizations; and we would ask them, is not the command of love as given (Matt. 18) binding upon all Christians? Is it not essential to the unity and purity, and hence, the perpetuity of the church? There can most assuredly be but one response, yea, verily it is. Again, must it not be admitted that under existing conditions this is impracticable? Let those reply who recognize denominationalism as orthodox. The different popular churches profess to be branches of the true vine; and the members of these churches profess to be brethren, though they differ and disagree in many things. We have been told by some persons who are members of one or the other of the different denominations, that they recognize members of other denominations as brethren. If they do, they owe a duty to them when they err, and that is to tell them their fault; and if they will not hear them, then proceed according to the command as given by Christ. It must be apparent to every reflecting mind, that with a divided church, the command cannot be obeyed. It is not an uncommon occurrence that persons are separated from one church, and then are received by another church, notwithstanding the testi-

mony of Christ, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven."

Whenever the church, by authority of God's word, excommunicates a member, such action is sanctioned in heaven, and by the church wherever it exists; since it is a united body, professing the same doctrine, under the guidance of the same spirit. The idea of a person standing in the relation of an excommunicated member of the church of Christ, and at the same time stand in full membership in the church of Christ, or some branch of it, is simply preposterous, and conclusively invalidates the theory of sectarianism. To accept such inconsistency would be to virtually ignore the fact of a visible church. It is vain to consider such commands as that of Matt. 18, so long as we admit of the doctrine of divisions; but holding the true ground and foundation, the way is open. We should add that there is no hope for an excommunicated person until he repents and renders full satisfaction to the church for his transgressions and obtains pardon from God, through Jesus Christ, when he is restored to membership in the visible, as he is in the invisible body. The church on earth and the church in heaven must be in harmony; or, in other words, the body must be in harmony with the Head.

The Human Body an Illustration of Christ's Spiritual Body, or Church.

In the natural body, the head is the seat of intelligence and of the power of volition. The head, or mind, devises

and contrives, the members being in perfect subjection to the head, obey and execute the designs of the mind or head. The body has power because the members obey and act in harmony. The comparison between the natural and the spiritual body is a strong one. Christ is the head of the spiritual body, the church. All the disciples of Christ are members of his spiritual body. He is the head from whence all spiritual intelligence emanates. The members obey him, being in entire subjection to him; and, as a consequence, harmonize. Members of the natural body sympathize with each other. When one member suffers, all the other members are in sympathy with it. So it will be in the spiritual body or church. We have said the comparison is a strong one. If it is warranted, then we have a ground for the unity of the church that no reasoning can overthrow. The effect of the union with Christ, which is attained through the spiritual baptism, is fittingly expressed by the Apostle, Eph. 4:16: "From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working of every part, making increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."

The Temple Built by Solomon, a Type of the Church of Christ.

First, we maintain that the natural temple at Jerusalem was a type of the church of Christ; and secondly, that its service was a type, or symbol, of the spiritual worship in the kingdom, or church, of Christ. We offer the follow-

ing testimony in proof of the first proposition. The natural temple was built of stone prepared by artisans, and each stone was so well adapted and fitted for its particular position in the building, that it was reared without the noise of iron instruments; "There was neither hammer, nor axe, nor any tool of iron, heard in the house while it was building." (1 Kings, 6:7.) How beautifully and expressively does all this typify the building of the spiritual house, or temple; and how significant and appropriate to our subject is the reference of the prophet and of the Apostles, to same: "Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation." (Isaiah 28:16.) "Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord." (Eph. 2;21.) "Ye are God's building;" "For ye are the temple of the living God;" "Ye also as lively stones are built up a spiritual house."

The Spiritual Material and its Preparation.

Upon the day of Pentecost the Apostles preached with great power; and the word was effectual in bringing conviction to many. They were pricked to their hearts, and realized their unsaved condition. They repented, forsook sin, and believed in the Lord Jesus Christ; received the Holy Spirit and were re-created. Three thousand persons became of one heart and of one soul. Upon that occasion the spiritual temple was established. Soon after the number increased to five thousand. Like the waters

Ezekiel beheld issuing out from under the threshold of the temple, which at first was ankle deep, then to the knees, to the loins, and finally a water that could not be passed over. So the life giving spirit, here compared to water issues from under the threshold of sanctified souls; and as the symbolic water constituted one, united body, so all those who are born again, and led by the spirit, are united, one and inseparable. If we can maintain the assertion that the literal temple is a figure of the spiritual, then the spiritual, or the antitype, must agree with the type, which leaves no room for division into sects or denominations. We now come to the second proposition.

The Temple Worship and Service a Type of the Spiritual Worship and Service of the True Temple.

True believers have in the atonement of Christ the substance of all that was foreshadowed by the ceremonial law. The altar, and the victim offered upon it, were types of Christ. Those who brought the offering, usually laid their hands upon the head of the animal to be offered, confessing their sins; when its blood was shed, and the flesh burnt upon the altar. But the blood of slain beasts could not take away sin. All this only had the shadow of the true sacrifice. It revealed the guilt and pollution of sin, and typified the means for its removal. The fall changed man's relation to God; for being defiled by sin, he could have no communion with a holy God. The curse of God's broken law was declared; and man's sins and iniquities separated between him and his God. The confession of sin over the head of the animal, the shedding of blood, the burning of the flesh, the perpetual fire, the ascending smoke, all clearly emphasized man's ruined and lost condition. But while the offerings and sacrifices under the law attested man's fallen state, they also were

the herald of hope pointing to "The lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world." The high priest entering the Holy of Holies once a year, was typical of Christ, the true High Priest, who entered the true sanctuary, (not made with hands) not with the blood of others, but with his own blood, and forever put away sin. Christ's offering consisted in becoming a sacrifice for sin. He knew no sin; he was holy, harmless and undefiled. He honored the law by perfect obedience. He endured the curse of the broken law, by suffering upon the cross the agony of the second death. He expiated our guilt, arose from the dead, and ascended to the Father; at whose right hand he is now seated, and is our merciful High Priest. As Christians, we are priests, "A royal priesthood," and "kings and priests unto God."

The priests under the law, when going into the tabernacle to perform religious service, were required to wash their hands and their feet. The washing of the body, or any part of it, was representative of moral impurity, and of the necessity of being washed in the blood of Christ. The Apostle Paul admonishes thus: "And having a High Priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." (Heb. 10 : 22). The brazen altar fitly represents Christ dying for sin, and the golden altar near the ark, as intercessor for his people.

In the spiritual temple, Christians constitute "a holy

priesthood, offering up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." (I Pet. 2 : 5). They worship in spirit and in truth. They present their bodies a living sacrifice. Having been cleansed by the blood of Christ, they, only, through the Spirit, offer up their body to the Lord ; that is, they bring it into subjection, mortifying the sinful passions and propensities. They forsake and crucify all manner of sin through the power of Christ, who washed them in his own blood, and made them kings and priests unto God. By the power of the Spirit, they rule their passions, and come hourly and daily to the fountain opened for sin and uncleanness. Thus we find that the temple in its natural construction, and in its priesthood and ceremonies, is clearly a figure and type of that temple not made with hands, of which Jesus Christ is the corner stone ; of that building that shall never wax old nor decay, but shall increase in glory and praise, world without end.

What Constitutes Christian Unity.

Since there is a wide difference of sentiment upon the subject under consideration, and since we recognize unity as one of the marks by which the church of Christ may be known, we feel constrained to discuss the subject a little further. I have before me a report of union or gospel meetings that were held in different towns and states. The different congregations hold union services by having the meeting at a different church each evening of the week, served by ministers of other churches than the one

where the meeting is held. The watchword is, "Less denominationalism and more religion." As an evidence of their comfort under those conditions, they refer to the Psalmist; "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." This appearance of unity leads many well disposed persons to believe that unity is attained. Let us see whether such a unity as the above will stand the test of reason and revelation. If they are united why do they keep up their separate organizations? In some small towns there are three churches, whereas one would accommodate all the worshipers. To many non-professors of religion, such divisions as now exist are irreconcilable with reason and scripture; and those who maintain and defend them are justly chargeable with strengthening the hands of the skeptic and darkening the way for the anxious inquirer after truth. The latter reasons thus: All God's works are characterized by unity of principle and harmony in operation. "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard." (Ps. 19:1-3.) Seed time and harvest, summer and winter, all in their appointed way, demonstrate a principle resulting in harmony. He concludes, if God's natural creation is characterized by harmony, why should not the new, spiritual creature, be found in agreement. Upon reading the sacred pages he meets with precept upon precept, and

line upon line, clearly inculcating unity; in consequence of which he concludes that there is an error somewhere, either that the churches that hold to and practice such views are not on the true foundation, or that the scriptures are either not true or not applicable to man's fallen state, teaching and requiring that with which he is unable to comply. Thus divisions in christianity are not helpful, but greatly hinder and perplex troubled, seeking souls.

We will conclude this subject by reaffirming the doctrine that the church of Christ is characterized by unity, and that there is no scripture authority for divisions; and that those who maintain that scriptural unity exists in the divided state that professed christians are now in, are in error, and should awaken and arise from their slumber, lest the night of death overtake them and the opportunity for repentance be cut off. If we maintain there is unity where not even the appearance of unity exists, we will be found false witnesses, testifying to that which is not true. There are very few persons who profess religion who do not recognize the doctrine of unity, but in most instances they are ignorant of the principle of unity. If all the denominations in their present state were to unite and put away denominational names, there would still be no true, spiritual unity; for to attain unity, all must have the Spirit of Christ, and be baptized by one spirit into one body. It is evident that the regenerating principle of love must be possessed by those who are the bride of the Lamb; which will unite them, and constitute them God's husbandry, God's building, God's church.

THE PEACEABLE CHURCH AND KINGDOM; ITS NON-RESISTANT CHARACTER A MARK OF IDENTITY.

We may introduce this subject very appropriately by making several quotations from the prophet: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulders." (Isaiah 9:6.) "They shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks." (Isaiah 2:4.) He was named by the prophet, "Prince of Peace." The life and teaching of our Lord Jesus and of his Apostles is in perfect accord with the above prophecies. Our Lord Jesus taught as follows: "I say unto you, that ye resist not evil." That we may not mistake his meaning, he further explains by saying, "But whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also; and if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." (Matt. 5:39, 40.) It is obvious that Christ forbade his disciples a privilege which was allowable under the Mosaic law. He quoted the precise text of the law which allowed the liberty of exacting justice. The laws, or ethics, as recorded in the Bible, which pertain to the civil polity of the Jews, were based upon justice, and were a rule by which the magistracy, or judges, should proceed in trying offenders. These were not allowances for the gratifying of revenge, but regula-

tions for the magistracy. It is apparent that the precepts which Moses gave did not authorize private revenge, but strictly forbade the infliction of injury upon any one from hatred, or the gratification of revenge. Hence it was not necessary for Christ to forbid the infliction of punishment to gratify spite; and he did *not* say, it was said to them of old time, an eye for an eye; but I teach you that when you are imposed upon, do not inflict personal injury upon the offender, neither entertain any spiteful feelings against him, but appeal to the magistracy for justice. When Christ taught, "*resist not evil.*" he meant that his followers should not do as the Jews did. The practice and the privilege of the Jews was to present their grievances to the magistracy; when testimony would be taken and the verdict rendered upon the principle of justice.

It is remarkable that a doctrine so plainly taught as that of non-resistance, by Christ and his Apostles, has attracted so little attention from the theologians of Christendom. It is a doctrine of great importance to mankind; since if obeyed, it would end litigation and war, and bring peace to the family and to the nation. Notwithstanding the plain teaching concerning non-resistance, and the demonstration of the principle of passive submission to insult and injury, by Christ and his Apostles in their lives, there are large numbers of professed Christians who controvert it. If we had no revelation except the New Testament, there would scarcely be the shadow of a ground upon which to base the doctrine of resistance of evil. War

and violence were among the fruits of the transgression of Adam. Sin enfeebled the moral powers of the soul, hardened the heart and darkened the understanding. The law of Moses was adapted to man in his unregenerate state. The civil polity of the Jews was in exact adaptation to man's capabilities, as under the hardness of heart. When the Pharisees interviewed Christ upon the subject of divorce, he taught them plainly that under the new covenant divorce was not admissible. They fully understood him, hence their question, "Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?" Mark his answer, "Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so." For the same cause they were granted the privilege of suing at law, and of waging wars, both offensive and defensive. Those who lived under the first covenant were not re-created; the lost love or kingdom was not restored to their hearts; therefore they were not able, neither was it required of them, to live according to the divine life which Christ subsequently brought from heaven. During the old dispensation, the "new and living way" into the holiest of all was not yet manifested.

The Lord, by the prophet Jeremiah, foretold the change of covenant he purposed making, saying, "Behold the days come saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel: not according to the covenant made with their fathers." Under the former covenant

the Lord's chosen people were allowed to sue at the law, to wage war, to give a bill of divorcement, and other carnal liberties. Under the new covenant all those privileges are denied. This raises the question, Does the Almighty change? Did not the Jews worship the same unchanging God whom we worship? We answer, yea, verily. God changes not; but we must bear in mind that the children of God are under a dispensation of grace, whereas the Jews were under a dispensation of justice. God has not changed, but the believer's relation to him is changed, in consequence of faith in Christ, and a restoration of the lost love and image to the soul. In consequence of this change, man is under the law of love, and does not resist evil.

It will be asked, why was it not wrong for the Jews to sue at the law and wage war, if it is wrong now for the Lord's people to do so? For the following reason: Christ had not yet come; the lost love was not restored; the Holy Spirit was not given as an abiding, re-creating principle; and man was not born again. The Jews were in possession of an earthly kingdom; their weapons of warfare were carnal, such as the helmet, the breastplate, the shield and the sword. By the sword their kingdom was established, and by the same means it was destroyed. By the sword they led others into captivity, and by the same means they were themselves led into captivity. They fought for their country and for their religion. Their warfare was characterized by a "confused noise and gar-

ments rolled in blood;" and was attended with wasting and destruction. How marked the contrast between their kingdom and warfare, and that of the believers under the new covenant. In the kingdom of Christ, *love* is the ruling principle. "On the earth, peace and good will to men." Christ, the Prince of Peace, rules and reigns in the hearts of his people.

His kingdom is not of this world; it is spiritual, unchanging and eternal. It is a peaceable kingdom in which war and litigation are not recognized by his subjects. When one of his disciples smote with the sword, he commanded him to put it into the sheath. He was using it in defence of one who was persecuted, but innocent, yet the act was reproved. Thus Christ issued an everlasting protest against the use of the sword by his disciples. The same disciple, now an apostle, testifies concerning Christ, "When he was reviled, he reviled not again; and when he suffered, he threatened not;" and he also inculcates the duty of following Christ in his example of submitting to suffer wrongfully. While the disciples were yet unconverted they asked, "Shall we pray that fire shall fall down from heaven and consume these, as Elijah did?" Here is "*Eye for eye, life for life*"—*the principle* which leads into litigation, and which causes war. Christ rebuked them, saying, ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of; for the son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." (Luke 9-54—56.)

Professed Christians generally admit that war and vio-

lence in defence of religion is wrong, since Christ and the Apostles set the example of suffering ignominy and death at the hands of their enemies for the sake of the truth. Christ also taught his disciples that when they were persecuted in one city they should flee into another, for he sent them forth as sheep in the midst of wolves. As sheep have no means of defense, and their only safety is in flight, so our Savior uses them to represent the defenseless and passive principle of his kingdom. It is an accepted fact that war in defence of religion is antichristian. If so, then we inquire by what scriptural authority may Christians contend for an earthly and perishable kingdom? It was not wrong for the Jews to defend their religion with the sword; and if we claim authority for the use of the sword from the fact that the Jews waged wars, then we also have the right to defend our religion with the sword. The fact however is that Christ has forbidden his followers the use of the sword as an offensive or defensive weapon. Since it is conceded that it is unchristian to use violence in defense of one's religion, it would appear that the question is settled; since Christ taught, "If any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." If it is unchristian to defend one's civil rights by process of law, even to the necessary comforts of the body, by what authority, or method of reasoning, can a Christian engage in the destruction of human life, though it be in defense of an earthly government. The Apostle Paul in his epistles commended those who

"took joyfully the spoiling of their goods, knowing in themselves that they had in heaven a better and an enduring substance." He also reproved those who were contending with each other about their worldly goods, saying, "Now there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another. Why do ye not rather take wrong? Why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?"

The subject of the necessity of worldly government for the protection of the law abiding, and the punishment of transgressors, presents itself for consideration. Human government undoubtedly is a necessity under existing conditions, and the sword is inseparable from worldly government. The Apostle Paul taught, "The powers that be are ordained of God." Again, "For he is the minister of God to thee for good; but if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." The above is a concise, yet lucid exposition of earthly government. Government is a blessing to society, while anarchy is a curse to any people; therefore any form of government is preferable to anarchy. Christ and his Apostles taught by precept and by example the duty of passive submission to the "*powers that be*"; thereby requiring our obedience to all laws not in opposition to the higher law of him who is "Prince of the kings of the earth." It is the duty of Christians to "submit themselves to every ordinance of

man for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well." (I Pet. 2:13,14.)

We now have reached an important point in this argument. It is well known how the beneficent government under which we live was established by the sword, with the sacrifice of thousands of precious lives, through many privations and great suffering of its people. In addition, its stability and perpetuation has cost an untold amount of suffering from exposure by its brave defenders in camp or upon the march, and in the loss of life and limb while engaged in fierce conflict upon the field of battle; together with an almost incalculable outlay of treasure. All of this great sacrifice appears to have been necessary for the establishment of the government of these United States, and for the stability thereof. We non-resistants share the fruits of all this vast sacrifice without having imperiled life and limb as did the brave defenders. This fact has unfavorably exercised the minds of some persons, and has caused sharp reflections upon us. We appreciate the good government under which we enjoy so many privileges, and highly honor the magistracy; but when the authorities require of us military service, we cannot comply, since our Lord and Saviour has taught us not to resist evil, and has commanded the sword to be put in the sheath. We can not refuse to obey our Lord. Beside, if all men would accept Christ, and suffer his spirit to rule

them, and live in conformity with his word, all warring would cease. Christians do not cause war, and therefore they are not censurable when they refuse to engage in it.

We cannot reconcile litigation and war with the loving and peaceable doctrine of Christ. We therefore divide mankind into two classes, constituting two kingdoms; the one, a spiritual and heavenly kingdom; the other, a worldly and perishable kingdom. The heavenly kingdom is based upon love, and will never fail. The redeemed of the Lord are found there. The worldly kingdom is established by the sword, and will perish with the sword, according to the language of Christ, "For all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." The citizens of the earthly kingdom are those who have not been adopted into the peaceable kingdom; although many of them are morally honest, and are possessed of lofty aspirations, laboring for the greatest natural good to the greatest number of their fellow-citizens. These two kingdoms do not harmonize. We cannot be a citizen of both at the same time. We must either be a citizen of the kingdom of peace, and be separated from the world, or else belong to the worldly kingdom, in which, if need be, it becomes our duty to defend. In the present state of the world, it is impossible to conduct a government upon peace principles. Therefore the magistracy are constrained to unsheath the sword to instil fear into the minds of faithless citizens, and to command respect among the nations of the earth. The rulers and citizens of such

kingdom may be highly honorable, but they cannot be Christians while they fill such positions, and discharge the duties therein; or in other words, they cannot serve God and mammon.

The admission that human government is of God, that those who administer it are ministers of God, that it is a blessing to society and indispensable to the happiness of mankind in their present condition, is apparently irreconcilable with the conclusion above reached, that those who administer the laws are not subjects of the Prince of Peace, and citizens of that kingdom in which there is neither war nor violence. By way of explanation, we observe that government is an accommodation to the present condition of mankind. Rulers of nations are ministers of God in the kingdom of this world. Not only the just and humane, but also the wicked and tyrannical rulers are God's ministers in his earthly kingdoms. Nero, Emperor of Rome, was a minister of God, notwithstanding his tyranny. Pharaoh was also his minister. "For the scripture saith unto Pharoah, even for this same purpose, have I raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth." (Rom. 9:17). Generals, kings and emperors have frequently been God's ministers, fulfilling his designs when they had in view only their own advancement; as we learn both from sacred and from profane history. God frequently uses the talented, the heroic and the aggressive in thought and action, as ministers for the accomplish-

ment of his purposes, in bringing about changes and revolutions in government and in society. But frequently they are unconscious ministers. A man may possess talent and bravery, and be very ambitious, seeking his own advancement and honor; yet God may use him as an instrument for the accomplishment of his designs. There have been many notable characters whose actions are recorded in history, who were governed by an exalted principle of patriotism and devotion to their country. These were undoubtedly ministers of God accomplishing, under the divine guidance, great good to mankind. It should, however, be remembered that the sacrifices of patriotic and wise generals and rulers had in view only the establishment and maintenance of an earthly and perishable kingdom. The object was not the advancement of the kingdom of peace.

The ministers in Christ's kingdom, are conscious ministers. They are led by his spirit, and have the mind of Christ. They love what he loves, and hate what he hates. Christ loved faith, purity, humility, unselfishness, and non-worldliness. "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews." (John 18:36). If all men were Christians there would be only one kingdom upon earth, and war would be unknown.

Human government is one of God's providences dispensed to mankind for their well-being. He cares for

all his creatures, hence he establishes the *powers that be*; and if his creatures are worthy, he gives them good rulers, but if they are wicked and unjust, he appoints wicked rulers over them for their correction. It is upon this principle that we recognize government and rulers as above stated, and think there is consistency in placing the *powers that be*, and the subjects thereof, as belonging to the world, and not to the kingdom of Christ.

Love being the underlying principle of Christ's kingdom; and, since love is divine and imperishable, those who possess it constitute his church and kingdom. Those who have faith and love have also power to overcome the world, and to live in peace. Where there are but two believers, *there* is the life and power, and *there* is the kingdom; and where there are a thousand, *there* is the same life and power, and there is the kingdom; and since no believer resists evil, but practises love to all, there is peace on earth, and good will to men, so far as Christ's kingdom obtains dominion.

A certain author after discussing the subject of non-resistance, and after canvassing the life and teaching of the Apostles, asks the following questions: "Did they ever slay any human being? or ever threaten to do so? Ever make use of any deadly weapon? Ever serve in the army or navy of any nation, state or chieftain? Ever seek or accept any office, legislative, judicial or executive, under the existing government? Ever make complaint to the magistrates against any offender, or criminal, in

order to procure his punishment? Ever commence any prosecution at law to obtain redress of grievances? Ever apply to the civil or military powers to protect them by force of arms in imminent danger? or ever counsel others to do any of these acts? Did they ever express by word, or deed, their reliance on political, military, or penal power, to procure personal protection, or to carry forward the Christianization of the world?" The above questions can be given a wide range. We might ask, has *any* Christian in the past done any of those things named in the above inquiry? Or will any Christian at present, or in time to come, do such things? We answer, *no*, they did not, and will not repel force by force, not even in defence of righteousness, much less in defence of their worldly, perishable goods. It is incontrovertible, that according to the doctrine of Christ, a Christian has not the right to apply to a court of justice to have his wrongs adjusted. "But I say unto you, resist not evil." By this precept the follower of Christ is restrained from repelling force by force, or becoming a prosecutor at law. What is here forbidden was plainly allowable to those under the law, as heretofore stated. We learn from authentic records that the Christians who lived in the first and second centuries positively refused to serve as soldiers and do military duty. They gave as a reason, that Christ forbade the use of the sword to his followers. In the beginning of the third century they began to do military service under the Emperor Constan-

tine; but at that time the main body of them had apostatized and become more carnal than spiritual. The true followers of Christ separated from the corrupt church at that time.

Christ's Kingdom an Everlasting and Unchanging Kingdom.

Christ's spiritual reign began on the day of Pentecost, when the hearts of those who believed were purified by faith, and became possessed of the Holy Ghost. Christ became their Spiritual Prince, and they his subjects, ruled by his spirit and word. "But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom." (Heb. 1:8). "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people." (Daniel 2:44). The principle of the kingdom is an unfailing one; therefore it will survive all other kingdoms. The prophet Isaiah in portraying the character and kingdom of Christ in ch. 9:6, 7, says, "The government shall be upon his shoulder," signifying how he would establish his kingdom by authority and power; and calls him "The everlasting Father," because his grace faileth not; and "*The Prince of Peace*," which is in harmony with the refrain of the angelic host—"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men," and in accord with what we have endeavored to maintain throughout this treatise. The prophet then adds, "Of

the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end"; which testimony is in harmony with the Apostle Paul's incomparable definition of charity in I. Cor. 13, in which we find "Charity beareth all things; * * * * * charity never faileth." Christ said to the Samaritan woman, "The water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." To Mary and Martha he said, "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." By these testimonies we are greatly encouraged to recommend that free salvation to all, and to urge the acceptance of the life and power of Christ.

Christians Cannot Consistently Take Part in the Worldly Government.

Worldly government is based upon the principle of justice. The constitution of the United States in part reads thus: "The congress shall have power to punish offences against the laws of nations; to declare war; grant letters of marque and reprisal; and make rules concerning captures on land and water; to raise and support armies."

The principle is, if necessary to the supremacy of the government, *to kill, slay and destroy.* This is in agreement with the principle of the civil law of Moses, "And thine eye shall not pity; but life shall go for life." The reason for such severity is given in these words, "So shalt thou put the evil away from among you." (Deut.) "Plead my cause, O Lord, with them that strive with me;

fight against them that fight against me ; let them be as chaff before the wind ; let their way be dark and slippery." (Ps. 35). "Thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them." (Deut. 7 : 2). Under the government of Christ, he that will be chief shall be the servant of all. It is also enjoined to love one's enemies, "But I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you ; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust" (Matt. 5 : 44, 45). "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors." "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger be put away." From these Scriptures, the difference between Christ's kingdom, or gospel requirements, and that of worldly governments, becomes very plain. The prophet Isaiah, foretelling Christ's glorious kingdom and government, says, "Violence shall no more be heard, wasting nor destruction within the borders ; but thou shalt call thy walls Salvation, and thy gates Praise." (Isa. 60 : 18). From the above comparison of the two kingdoms, it should be plain to every one that a non-resistant cannot consistently hold office under civil government. The duty of the magistracy, if necessary, is to declare war, to raise and support armies for the suppression of insurrection, and to repel invasion. The office of

the church of Christ is to be in harmony with and to proclaim that heavenly message, "on the earth peace, and good will toward men"; and to ever reverberate it by her practice and defense of the Gospel of Peace.

If the Christian cannot consistently take an oath of office, how can he assist in placing another person in office? If he cannot consistently bear arms, then he cannot consistently appeal to the magistracy and seek redress of grievances through the courts of justice. War and litigation are the same in principle; if the former is unchristian, then the latter is also. In either case he enters into a coalition with the principles of force. Persons not comprehending the true gospel principle, may be very inconsistent in claiming exemption from military service on the ground of non-resistance, and yet defend their property by appealing to the courts. By way of illustration, if a professed non-resistant would institute legal proceedings against a thief, he would by that act declare war against him, by authorizing his arrest by the use of force, if necessary. A true Christian understands the principle of non-resistance; for he posesses it in his heart. He loves all mankind, and does not resist violence; but, like his Lord and Master, when he suffers he threatens not.

Objections to the Doctrine of Non-Resistance.

We are referred to the circumstance of Cornelius, the Roman centurion, who was converted under the preaching of Peter; but as there is nothing recorded that he

abandoned his office as commander of soldiers, neither that Peter taught him to do so, it is used by some against the defenseless doctrine. Peter taught him obedience to the commands of Christ; and he having received the spirit of truth, which leads into all truth, undoubtedly was led into the obedience of the Gospel. From the nature of the circumstances, we are warranted to assume that Cornelius abandoned the military service, and was a follower of the Prince of Peace.

It is asserted that John the Baptist did not require the soldiers to quit their service, that he only taught them to be just, and "to do violence to no man." It is maintained that they were Roman soldiers, and could not likely have abandoned their calling, as they would thereby have forfeited their lives. We answer, John was not a teacher under the New Covenant. One part of his mission was to teach reformation of life; and if the soldiers whom John addressed continued loyal to their sovereign, but yet heeded John's counsel, they would at least not be guilty of imposing upon civilians, or committing assaults upon defenseless citizens, of which they were not always innocent. It was not John's mission to promulgate the precepts of Christ's kingdom, since that kingdom had not yet come.

Some persons profess to be perplexed about the passage in Luke, 22 : 36: "And he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one." To any one acquainted with the life and doctrine of Christ, it must be

apparent that he had not reference to natural swords; for when he afterward reproved Peter for using the sword, he clearly demonstrated his disapproval of its use, by his disciples, as a weapon for defense. The disciples securing two swords, said, "Lord, behold, here are two swords." He replied, "it is enough." Yet two swords could not be enough to arm eleven men. One of these, at the command of Christ, was sheathed; the other one, the sword of the world, is yet unsheathed; and, consequently, there continue to be wars. Since Christ forbade the use of the sword to his disciples, he could not have intended that they should buy swords for the purpose of resistance; for he has since then nowhere in his word countermanded the import of his order to Peter on that occasion. The language is figurative, with a spiritual application. It implies that after his removal from them, they would be required to suffer persecution, and undergo many trials, and endure much suffering; and that it was all important for them to get ready for the great conflict by becoming willing to sacrifice the garment of *self-will*, that they might obtain the heavenly armor and especially the sword of the spirit, with which they could successfully wage war against the world, the devil, and their own sinful nature.

It is asserted that Christ's language as recorded, Matt. 5:17, militates against the doctrine of non-resistance. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." When

this scripture is rightly understood, instead of antagonizing non-resistance, it supports it. The embodiment of the law, is *love*. The moral law has been, and ever will be, the standard of duty toward God, and toward our fellow-man. Christ did not come to destroy that law, but to fulfil it by his perfect obedience to it in all its extensive spiritual requirements, in his life, sufferings, doctrine and death, as the surety for his people. By virtue of Christ's fulfilment of the law, God receives the believing soul, and justifies him; and yet He remains just. No one can come to the Father but by the Son, who fulfilled the law for every believer. The law is the standard of judgment to the sinner. It requires obedience, and declares the curse upon all disobedience; there is no abatement. There is but *one* way of escape, and that is by faith in Christ. When the sinner recognizes the just demands of the law, and realizes his unsaved condition, and embraces Christ by faith, as him who fulfilled the law in his stead, and accepts *him* as his righteousness, he is delivered from the curse of the law, and is under grace. The ceremonial law had only the shadow of the good things to come. Christ is the substance of all the shadows, and the reality of all the types. He fulfilled the intent of it, and revealed the blessings typified by it. The objection to the text is supposed to be in this; that as the law exacted justice to the extent of life for life, and since Christ did not destroy the law, believers now have the right to exact justice. If we accept such a conclusion, we are placed under the

law, and become debtors to all the commandments contained therein. Every one will see that such a claim proves too much. The obvious meaning of the text is that the moral law is the standard of duty; and the essence of it is incorporated in the Gospel. The Christian is in harmony with its requirements; but, through the weakness of the flesh, he is unable to live up to its high standard; hence he accepts the righteousness of Christ as his only hope and salvation.

It is claimed that when Christ forbade the resistance of evil, he only intended to correct the abuse of the law; such as to gratify spite under pretext of justice. We have met and refuted this objection in the forgoing pages. Another explanation is, Christ intended his followers to be peaceable, and not to resent small offenses that were of a personal nature; but far-reaching injuries should be resented. Thomas Scott's exposition of Matt. 5 : 38–40, is in part as follows: "The law referred to, was a judicial regulation, and the magistrates' rule in deciding causes. The Scribes explained it as if it had authorized private revenge; but Christ declared that the moral law required the reverse of this vindictive spirit. His disciples are not allowed to resist evil, either by violent opposition, or litigious law suits. In the present state of human nature, there is little need to enumerate exceptions and limitations to such general rules; *self-love will suffice, and more than suffice.* The preservation of life, or liberty, or important property, authorizes, and in many cases requires a

man to stand in his defence at the peril of the illegal assailants; but in ordinary cases it is better to give way and yield to insults and injuries, than to repel them by force, or legal process; and it does not accord with the spirit of christianity to put the life and soul of man in competition with a sum of money, however great, when there is no reason to fear further violence. In smaller matters, however, the case is quite clear." Thus this learned man continues his explanation of a very plain precept of our Lord. In one sentence he admits that it is dishonorable to the cause of Christ to resent an injury, either by physical force, or by legal process; and in another he maintains that when great interests are at stake, it may become a duty to resist the evil according to the dictates of self-love, which, he says, will suffice, and more than suffice. Scott was a man of great mind, and deep natural understanding; but his exposition of Christ's self-denying doctrine, demonstrates anew the inability of man, through learning and natural wisdom, to comprehend the mysteries of the gospel. and of the new birth.

Another explanation of the precept, "resist not evil," made by those who are not willing to accept it in its plain and weighty import, runs thus: Christ intended that his immediate followers should be peaceable; and this precept was intended especially for them, and for the primitive Christians who lived under tyrannical governments where resistance would have been fruitless, or useless. Such conclusion is absurd. Christ need not teach

his disciples that which common sense would teach them. Such exposition ignores the principle underlying the precept. Christ brought the principle of the divine life from heaven, which he by his spirit impresses upon every Christian heart; therefore the doctrine and life of the Christian is the same in every century, and in every country. The life in the soul consists of the love of God, which is unfailing and unchanging; and where this life exists, the repelling of force by force ceases. It is painful to us to reflect upon the light and trifling manner in which such precepts are treated, even by learned persons.

Christ Purifying the Temple.

By some persons it is claimed that Christ's action as recorded, John 2 : 13–16 was at variance with non-resistance. It is recorded that he made a scourge of small cords, and drove those out who sold oxen, and sheep and doves; and poured out the changers money, and overthrew the tables, and said unto them that sold doves, "take these things hence; make not my Father's house an house of merchandise." There is something remarkable about this action of the Lord. It is possible it occurred at the time of the first passover after he entered upon his public ministry. When it is considered what an immense number of sacrifices were required at the passover, (256,500 lambs alone at the time of Cestius) we may conclude that the market was a large one, and the attendance very large. Jesus appeared as a comparative stranger, without human authority, and unarmed, save

the weapon of a whip platted of small cords. The corruption evidently was great. Covetous traders, shielded by corrupt priests, intruded into the court of the temple and profaned it. When we consider the number of the traders and their rapacity, we can discover abundance of incentive to resistance. They were evidently overawed by his presence, and by the divine energy that attended his words. *We have no evidence that he used any physical force in driving them out.* His presence and words, with probably uplifted hand, holding the scourge, were attended with such power, that they retreated with their cattle, and in their haste overthrew the table of the money changers. We recognize a marked similarity between this event and the time of the apprehension of our Saviour. He asked the soldiers, "whom seek ye?" They answered him, "Jesus of Nazereth." He replied, "I am he." His word was attended with such power, that they fell back like dead men.

The energy and power displayed by our Lord in purifying the temple, is a figure of the cleansing of our hearts through the power of his spirit. The literal temple was defiled by becoming a house of merchandise; so our hearts are defiled by sin and uncleanness.

Paul's Acts no Warrant for Self-Defence.

The apostle never commenced a prosecution at law for redress of grievances. The cases cited by those who defend resistance to evil, were such that occurred when he was a prisoner in charge of the magistracy. The first

instance mentioned is when he with Silas was cruelly beaten by order of the authorities, and then thrown into prison. The next morning the magistrate sent word to the prison to let Paul and Silas go. Paul was unwilling to be released in that way. As they were condemned without lawful authority, he was not willing to be sent away privily. All he asked was an honorable discharge: there was no resistance on the part of the apostles. No force was employed and they simply asked what was due them; and it remained with the magistrate to respect the request, or to refuse it.

The next instance was when the Jews at the temple had raised a mob and were beating Paul to kill him. The chief captain came and took him out of their hands, but the Jews clamored for his life. When Paul attempted a verbal defense, they were wrought up to a frenzied state of feeling, and exclaimed, "away with such a fellow, for it is not fit that he should live." Under these extraordinary circumstances the captain commanded him to be bound with two chains, and then that he should be carried into the castle, that he might be examined by scourging, to learn what his crime was. Paul being a free-born, Roman citizen, and knowing his privilege, simply asked the officer for his authority for beating a Roman citizen uncondemned. All Roman citizens were entitled to a fair trial; and Paul knowing this, used his privilege. This act of the Apostle involves no resistance. Resistance implies the repelling of force by force, either by physical strength, or

by an appeal to the magistracy, for the punishment of those who injure us.

In the 23rd chapter of Acts, we read that Paul had a partial hearing before the chief priests and their counsel. At this time more than forty Jews had bound themselves under a curse that they would kill him. Paul's nephew learning of this told him. He then asked to have his nephew taken to the captain; and when the captain learned of the conspiracy to kill Paul, he hastily sent him away to Cesarea, where Felix the Governor abode. As an escort, he sent four hnndred and seventy men. It is to be borne in mind that Paul did not ask for such protection. He simply wished the captain, as an officer of the law, whose prisoner he was, to know the facts. Historians say that the journey was over a road infested with robbers, hence the large escort. In the 25th chapter of Acts, we learn that after Paul had been a long time a prisoner, uncondemned, Festus became governor, and the Jews besieged *his* court. They brought their orator with them to implead Paul. Festus, wishing to favor the Jews, asked Paul whether he would go to Jerusalem to be judged there of those things whereof the Jews accused him. Paul upon this occasion, simply used his privilege, by appealing to Cæsar. He knew full well that he would get no justice at Jerusalem, as they were thirsting for his blood there; therefore he appealed to the Roman authorities to judge him. If they found him worthy of death he would not refuse to die; but conscious of his innocence, and that

the Jews had no cause against him, he was unwilling voluntarily to put himself into their power. In all this there was no appeal for satisfaction against his enemies. There was no violence practiced, nor recommended, and no retaliatory spirit manifested. Paul was a prisoner, and he could not flee from his persecutors. If he had been free, he would have done so, as on other occasions; but now being deprived of that liberty, he simply practised the wisdom of the serpent, and the harmlessness of the dove.

We have previously in this treatise demonstrated with scriptural authority, that the material temple built by Solomon was a figure of the church of Christ, and of its unity and peaceable character. Solomon's father was not qualified to build the temple because he was a *man of war.* Solomon had a peaceable reign, that is, he did not wage wars. He was in that partiular a type of the spiritual Solomon, Jesus Christ, who built the spiritual house, or church. The circumstance of David's disqualification for building the temple is very significant; the more so when we consider his great zeal in the worship of the God of Israel, and his being the "Sweet Psalmist of Israel;" but the type must be true to the anti-type. His zeal and integrity could not eliminate his disqualification. The material temple was only a type of the spiritual, yet a man of war could not build it because it was designed to foreshadow Christ's peaceable kingdom.

The city of refuge under the law was a type of Christ, our spiritual refuge and safety. The manslayer repre-

sented the sinner fleeing from the threatenings of the law to Christ, his only refuge. The avenger of blood represented the just threatenings of a holy law. While in the city of refuge, he was safe; but he could not be an avenger of blood while there; prefiguring the defenseless character of the Christian.

The prophet Isaiah, in his majestic eloquence, often brought forth strong and most significant figures in his foreshadowing of the character and kingdom of Christ. We quote the eighth and ninth verses of the thirty-fifth chapter. "And an highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called the way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those; the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein. No lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast shall go up thereon; it shall not be found there, but the redeemed shall walk there." We consider this a strong and appropriate text in confirmation of the doctrine we are advocating. The prophet foretold Christ's triumph over death and hell, and the opening of the way which leads to heaven; and also, under the figure of the lion and the ravenous beast, typified the nature of man, and that he cannot travel upon that way while he possesses his destructive principle of retaliation. In the vegetable kingdom the bramble, the brier, and the thistle are representative of the carnal and unconverted state of man, and of his fighting nature; while the fig tree, the olive, the vine, and the lily are representative of the loving and peaceable principle of the

Christian life. In the animal kingdom, the lion, the wolf, the tiger, and the bear are representative of the fierce, destructive and crafty principle of human nature. The sheep, the lamb, and the dove beautifully typify the peaceable and non-resistant principle of the redeemed of the Lord.

It is claimed by many persons that non-resistants set their mark too high; and that the peace doctrine is impracticable in the present state of the world. They maintain that the time will come when righteousness will cover the earth as the waters cover the sea; when destruction and violence shall cease, and then the peace doctrine will be practised. I would inquire, under what influence and power is the Christian now? Is he not a son of God, and led by the spirit of God? Is he not in harmony with the heavenly economy, which is to love God supremely, and thy neighbor as thyself? Are not all God's true worshipers under one economy? We maintain that all the spiritual worshipers in all worlds are under one and the same law. Granting that there will be a millenium, will not the worshipers then be under the same guidance, and have the same divine law, as those now living? And will those now living not live the same lives that those during the millenium will? Again, if there will be such a time upon earth as the believers in the millenium look for, there will be no need for such command as "resist not evil"; for there will be no evil there. "If a man smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." What use of

such command then, when there will be none who smite? Non-resistance is consistent, and now is the time to practice it.

There is but one divine life, which is love. Christ possesses that life, and communicates it by his spirit to all believers. The life of all the believers now upon earth, is the same life that the angels have in heaven; and as there is peace in heaven, so there must be peace upon earth, as far as the divine life extends. If the divine life does not bring peace now, how will it produce it at any future time?

WATER BAPTISM.

The Right use of Ordinances a Mark of the True Church.

"Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." (Matth. 28:19-20.)" The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved." Acts 2:47. Acording to the above text, no one should be baptized until he has come to years of undertanding, and to a saving knowledge and experience of the redemption wrought by Jesus Christ. To this he cannot attain until he realizes his unsaved condition, and experiences the saving power of Christ. Through the knowledge of the law, he realizes his defiled and lost condition which produces an humble and penitent feeling, and fits him to obtain peace and pardon by faith in Christ. Only penitent, believing persons are fit subjects for baptism. Such may be baptized in the name of the Father, since they recognize his righteousness, his love and his mercy; in the name of the Son, since they accept him as their sanctification and redemption; in the name of the Holy Ghost, since they have come under his enlightening and purifying influence. Any one to be a fit subject for baptism and church membership, must be in agreement with the

principle underlying the moral law; which principle is brought out clearly in the Gospel, in the exercise of supreme love to God, and the practice of loving our neighbors as ourselves. Wanting this change, no one can be fitly baptized in the name of the Trinity. Baptism is a representation of having, by faith, put on Christ with his cleansing virtues.

Infant Baptism.

The baptism of infants is practised by many religious denominations, and is defended by learned speakers and authors. We have a treatise in defence of infant baptism before us, in which one of the arguments is based upon the command, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them," etc. It is claimed that the correct rendering of the text is, "Make disciples of all nations, baptizing them," etc. The argument for infant baptism runs thus: "The text is not limited to believers; it declares, make disciples of all nations; and as nations are composed of men, women, and children, children are to be baptized." It is further asserted that "the fact of children not being named in the command, is no argument against their baptism; as men and women are also not named; and accepting such objection, none could be baptized, since they are not specified. But such conclusion," it is stated, "is contrary to the text." The argument concludes, "Therefore, I am authorized to baptize all who compose a nation, men, women, and children. The text puts all in a savable state." The above argument is remarkable; the more

so since it is offered by a learned minister. The conclusion of his reasoning is, that nations are to be baptized, and that baptism makes them disciples. The fact is baptism alone makes no one a disciple; neither are whole nations to be baptized. Nations shall be taught, and only those who believe shall be baptized; and as children cannot be taught, neither can they believe, therefore, they are not proper subjects for baptism. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Taking the latter part of this sentence in connection with the former, it will appear that believing is necessary to salvation; and, as a consequence, an essential qualification for receiving baptism. The advocates of infant baptism claim that the above proves too much. They state it thus: "Faith is required in order to baptism, but infants cannot exercise faith, therefore infants cannot be baptized." Here follows their conclusion: "Faith is required in order to salvation, but infants cannot exercise faith, therefore infants cannot be saved." "Awful conclusion," say they, and ask, "What Christian parent's heart does not recoil at the very idea?" But no such *awful conclusion* will follow a fair statement of the case. The true representation is this: Faith is not required of infants unto salvation; but of adults it is required. Little children have the promise without the exercise of repentance, or faith, or the receiving of baptism. Therefore neither is required of them. Hear the testimony of John: "Behold the Lamb of

God that taketh away the sin of the world"; and the words of our Savior, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

Christ, by virtue of his fulfillment of the law, by perfect obedience thereto, of his atoning sacrifice upon the cross, and of his resurrection from the dead, and ascension to the right hand of the Father, has paid the debt incurred by our first parents; and has reconciled man to God. Infants are saved without baptism, by virtue of the sacrificial offering of Christ. Every ordinance that Christ enjoined upon his church, embodies a principle adapted to the experience of regenerated souls; which tends to confirmation in the faith, and sanctification in the spirit. The ordinance of baptism has no meaning to an unconverted person; therefore none such shall be baptized; and if unbelieving adults are not fit subjects for baptism, then, surely, infants are not proper subjects.

Infant Baptism Defended Upon the Ground of the Old and the New Covenant Being Identical.

They further argue that "The congregation of Israel was the church of God, and it was virtually the same as the New Testament church. Having had the same divine, the same precious covenant, the same spiritual object in view, the same atoning blood, the same sanctifying spirit, and the same great promise of heaven and eternal life." It is true that there was, and is, but the one, only divine Head, and ground of hope and happiness.

But, it is also true, that before God was manifest in the flesh, and wrought redemption, there was no regenerated person upon the earth, and no spiritual church. The serpent's head was not bruised; the armor was not taken from the strong man armed; the hearts of the people were not purified; the Holy Ghost was not given as an indwelling, transforming power; and they were not "re-created after the image of him who did create them."

The Lord said to Abraham, "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee; and I will give unto thee and to thy seed after thee, the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession." (Gen. 17 : 7, 8.) As a token of this covenant, and as an evidence of Abraham's assent, circumcision was instituted. All male children were circumcised when eight days old; also those bought with money of any stranger. "He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised; and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant." (Gen. 17 : 13.) Human language could not make anything plainer than the covenant relation between God and Abraham, viz: That God promised to give the land of Canaan to Abraham's seed, or posterity; and as a token thereof, they were to circumcise all their male children throughout their generations, and he would be a God to them in succeeding generations. But on account of their disobed-

ience, God's wrath fell upon them, and he frequently suffered the Gentile nations to oppress them, and lead them captive into strange lands. Finally their city was trodden down by the Gentiles, and they were scattered among the nations of the earth, and became a byword and a reproach, and God ceased to be their God according to the covenant relation. The literal sacrifices ceased, and the ceremonial law came to an end, since they could no longer offer their sacrifices in the appointed way and place. Paul testifies: "But now hath Christ obtained a more excellent ministry; by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place be found for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. In that he saith, a new covenant, he maketh the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." (Heb. 8 : 6.) Christ plainly foretold the closing of that dispensation, saying, "Behold your house is left unto you desolate." When he said, "It is finished," and bowed his head, and gave up the ghost, the burnt offerings and the sacrifices virtually ceased; for the substance of the shadows, and the reality of the images were consummated.

The benefit resulting from the covenant with Abraham, as already shown, was the land of Canaan, together with

the blessing of a numerous posterity; and all this upon the condition of obedience, as afterwards stated in the law. If they proved faithful, they were assured of enjoying blessings and prosperity in all things. But, on the other hand, if they became disobedient, and persisted in their disobedience, the blessing would be withheld, and a curse be sent instead. It is to be borne in mind, that upon conditions of obedience, they enjoyed temporal prosperity, *whether they exercised faith in the promised woman's seed or not.* They were a chosen nation, yet they were a carnal people. Eternal life was not promised in the covenant above considered. The hope of eternal life was held out in the promise, distinct from that of the land of Canaan: "And in thy *seed* shall all the families of the earth be blessed." The meaning of this was, that through the lineage of Abraham, the Savior should be born according to the flesh: he through whom life and immortality should be brought to light. The truly godfearing Jews, by faith embraced the promise of the future spiritual blessing, and believed in the coming Savior, although they were not changed in the sense of *being born again.* In consequence of their faith and obedient lives, they obtained a good report; but they did not receive the promise. Under the first covenant the law was engraven upon tables of stone. Their sanctuary, and their service in it, was but a shadow of the good things to come. Their circumcision was outward in the flesh, their inheritance was a natural land, their enemies were the heathen

nations, their weapons were natural, and their warfare was that of "garments rolled in blood." Under the new covenant, the law is written in the heart, and put in the mind; the sanctuary is the heart; the service is in the spirit and not in the letter; the inheritance in this life, is a good conscience, and a peace that passeth understanding; the enemies are the devil, the world, and our sinful nature; and the weapons of warfare are spiritual, having the breastplate of faith and love, and, for an helmet, the hope of salvation.

The advocates of infant baptism assert that the covenant with Abraham has never been abolished; and as children were eligible to church membership under the Abrahamic covenant, so they also are under the new or Christian covenant. In other words they assert that baptism is now substituted for circumcision. It is true the covenant contained in these words, "And in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed," has never been abolished. Paul, writing to the Galatians, explains this promise as referring to Christ, "And to thy *seed*, which is Christ." The promise was a blessing by that one *Seed*, Christ. He is the promised Seed, through whom alone the blessing can be obtained; not of natural land, but of life forevermore; which inheritance is not obtained through baptism, but through regeneration. The Jews were not an organized body of believers; and therefore, cannot consistently be called a church. They constituted a nation, a political body, many of whom were

wicked. Circumcision was a mark of citizenship required of all male citizens; therefore all the male children of the Jews were required to be circumcised, *whether the parents were pious or not.* There is no scriptural authority for the assertion that baptism was substituted for circumcision. When allusion is made by the Apostle to circumcision, it is used figuratively as a type of regeneration, and not as being superseded by baptism. When the Jews were offended at Paul's preaching, because he taught that chidren need not be circumcised, he did not offer them a substitute in baptism.

The defenders of infant baptism refer to a portion of the 11th chapter of Romans, where the Apostle warns the Gentile believers against the danger of backsliding, by reminding them of their high privilege of being children of God by faith in Christ. By way of illustration, the Apostle reminds them that they had been branches in the wild olive, that is, of the Gentiles, who were strangers to the covenant of promise, and lived, as it were, without God in the world. But now as they have by faith been grafted into the good olive tree, they are admonished to be humble, and not forget that they do not bear the root, but the root bears them; that is, they shall remember that they were not chosen on account of any merit in them; but that God, out of free grace, extended mercy toward them; and that they were not saved by works of righteousness which they had done. The advocates of infant baptism maintain that the Jewish congregation was

the good olive tree, or the Jewish church, as they call it; and that through unbelief many of them were broken off, that is, were excluded from the church; and that the Gentiles by faith were grafted into the good olive tree, the Jewish church. By this argument they want to prove that the church has been the same under both dispensations, and that the Christian church is a continuation of the Jewish church; and as they admitted the male children into the Jewish church by circumcision, children shall now be admitted into the Christian church by baptism.

They reason plausibly that the covenant with Abraham was an everlasting covenant, and that God had promised to be their Father, and they be his people, which they call his church; and since the Jews knew nothing different than to admit children, therefore it would have been an unheard of thing to them, to exclude children from the church. They assert that a prohibition from Christ would have been necessary to exclude them. It will be observed that upon the above ground, viz: that of the church being the same under both dispensations, Christians have a right to wage war in defence of righteousness, to enact justice by process of law, to sue for a bill of divorce, and even greater carnal liberties. For if those under the law were regenerated, and constituted the church of God, worshiping him in spirit and in truth, and yet did wage wars and indulge in many carnal liberties, then we will ask, why may not God's children now use

the same liberties? Every enlightened person knows that Jesus Christ and his Apostles forbid those carnal practices. Can a child of God be one thing in one age, and something quite different in another age? The natural birth has been the same in all countries and all ages, and Christ used it as a figure of the spiritual birth. How then can the spiritual life be so different in its manifestations at different times; as, in one age, to resist evil to the extent of waging war, sueing at law, practicing polygamy, and holding persons in bondage; and, in a subsequent age, to ignore all of the above practises as unchristian.

Stephen alone calls the congregation of Israel the *church*, saying, "This is he that was in the church in the wilderness." (Acts 7 : 38.) The German uses the same word in this instance, that is used throughout the Bible to designate the congregation of Israel. Some translations render it the congregation. Whether we call the Jews the congregation, community, kingdom, or church, the facts remain; they were an unregenerated people, and the great mass of them were frequently idolatrous and wicked. It is well known that there were god-fearing persons among them, who believed in the promise of the coming Savior, and regulated their lives accordingly; and who also died in the blessed hope of eternal life. But they did not attain to that life while upon earth; since Christ had not yet come to give them power to become the sons of God. But when he came and gave his life for the sins of the world, he descended into the nether-

most parts of the earth, and proclaimed redemption to those who had died in the faith before he came.

The church of Christ was a new institution upon earth, based upon the promise of eternal life. Christ said, "Upon this rock I will build my church." This language is conclusive. The church had not existed before the day of Pentecost. This fact alone should determine the issue. Any one tracing the commands and ordinances enjoined by Christ upon his church, must be convinced that it bears no likeness to the Jewish congregation. Paul asserts, "And for this cause he is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions *that were under the first testament*, they which are called might receive the promise of the eternal inheritance." (Heb. 9 : 15). Under the first testament, they had the promise of the land of Canaan upon condition of obedience; but eternal life, or the eternal inheritance, was dependent upon the efficacy of Christ's death; which availed before God as a real atonement, and a ransom for the trangressions committed even by believers under the legal dispensation; who, during their lifetime, did not obtain the heirship to the everlasting inheritance.

Christ is the good olive tree. The patriarch, the prophets, and the holy men of old, were prospective branches in the good olive. Those Jews who believed and yet lived when Christ came, received him. The aged Simeon said, "Now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace,

for mine eyes have seen thy salvation." And Paul in Gal. 3: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many." "And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed. So, then, they that be of the faith, are blessed with faithful Abraham." From the above scriptures it is plain that Christ is the good olive tree, and that Abraham was a prospective branch in him; and so were all who stood in the same faith. All the Old Testament believers were under the promise, and were acceptable to God; but did not constitute his church, as they were not organized into church fellowship. Indeed they could not be in true church order; because they had not the Holy Spirit as an abiding and indwelling principle. The unbelieving Jews who composed for the larger part of the congregation, rejected Christ, and were broken, or cut off from their privileges as the descendants of Abraham. "He came unto his own and his own received him not." The offer was first made to them, but when they rejected it, God also rejected them. If they repent, God will graft them again into the good Olive Tree, in whom their father Abraham hoped.

The matter relative to infant baptism may be summed up thus: Under the old dispensation, there was a command to circumcise male children; under the new, there is no command nor precedent for the baptism of children;

but a plain, positive command to baptize adult believers. Does it not appear very strange that if the Jews were the church of God, and if the Christian Church is a continuation of the Jewish church with changed ordinances, and the spiritual life the same in both the old and the new church; that Christ required a radical change in the character of those who were members of the Jewish church in order to become members of his church, and that not only of those who were only of the lineal descent of Abraham, but also of those who stood in the faith of Abraham. "He came unto his own, and his own received him not; but as many as received him, to them gave he *power to become the sons of God.*" If they had been children of God, why should he give them power to become what they already had been? To his disciples who were pious, believing Jews, (Judas excepted) he said, "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven;" and hence were unqualified for church membership. Christ's church was not then organized. It was not established until the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Ghost was given as an abiding principle.

Jewish Proselyte Baptism.

Labored efforts have been made to prove infant baptism from historical records. The claim is that Jewish proselytes were circumcised and baptized; and that this practice continued until the time of Christ. By this it is claimed that infant baptism was a matter familiar to all

Jews; and of course they would expect a continuation of it in the Christian church. Mamonides, a learned Jew of the twelfth century, is given as special authority for the assertion, that proselyte baptism was common among the Jews. Josephus, a noted Jewish historian, who was born A. D., 37, did not name such practice as that of baptizing the children of proselytes. But we will not spend time on this argument, as every Bible reader knows that the Jews were strictly forbidden to add anything to God's law. "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you." (Deut. 4:2). If the Jews did baptize proselytes and their children, they added to the commandment of the Lord, and were transgressors of the law. They had a command to circumcise such, but not to baptize them. To defend the practice (if it ever existed) is to justify God's people in the violation of his plain command. But if they did practice it, is it not remarkable that not one of the prophets protested against such an innovation? And inasmuch as no such protest is found in the writing of the prophets, this alone is strong and conclusive evidence that such practice never existed during their time.

Another argument in favor of infant baptism is based on Acts 2:39: "For the promise is to you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." It is claimed that the promise is the same as that in Gen. 17:7, to Abraham; "to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee;" and as seed means children, and children means seed; and as parents

and children were included in the one, it must be that parents and infants are intended in the other. It will be observed that the promise was not only to them and to their children, "but to all who are afar off, even as many as God *shall call.*" Surely no one will be called who has not come to years of understanding. The promise extends to all who are called; it extends to us and to our children, and to all sane persons who may be born into the world, if we and they yield obedience to the Grace of God, and are regenerated through the spirit and word of the Lord. Primarily the promise was to the Jews and to their children, and then to the Gentiles, who were considered afar off; but who were afterwards brought nigh by faith in Christ. There is nothing whatever in the text to support infant baptism.

The last argument we will notice is that of the baptism of households. One learned advocate of infant baptism says, "It cannot be denied that Lydia and Stephanus, Cornelius and the jailor were the only believing members in their respective families." This assertion is void of scriptural proof. In the case of Cornelius it is recorded, "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word." Again, "can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Could anything be plainer? These were all adults, for they "*spake with tongues and magnified God.*"

The defenders of infant baptism say, "Not a word is

said that any of Lydia's household believed, and yet we are informed that she and her household were baptized; and that it is manifest that those who composed the household were baptized on the faith of the parent." We ask, where is the scriptural authority to baptize one person upon the faith of another? Christ and his apostles commanded baptism upon faith; not upon the faith of another; but upon the faith of the individual believer. Paul baptized the house of Stephanus. He says, 1 Cor. 16:15, "Ye know the house of Stephanus, that it is the first fruits of Achaia, and that *they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints.*" From this we infer that the members of the house were not infant children, but were persons of understanding, and of will power.

Of the Jailor it is written, "And they said, believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, *and to all that were in his house.*" (Acts 16). They would not have spoken the word of the Lord to infant children. It is evident that they baptized only those to whom they had spoken the word of the Lord; therefore they baptized none but believers.

We will not attempt to refute the argument based upon the testimony of the church fathers; as it would enlarge this treatise beyond our wish; neither do we deem it a duty. In many cases the testimony is from such who were not sound in doctrine. For example, Irenaus, who wrote about sixty years after the Apostles, is quoted as

follows: "Christ came to save all persons who by him are born again (baptized) unto God; infants, and littles ones, and children." Can little ones be born again? Baptism is not the new birth. Tertullian, who lived about the beginning of the third century, is quoted as authority for the baptism of children; yet we have evidence that he recommended the delay of baptism until mature years. In what century of the Christian era the baptism of children came into use, is difficult to ascertain. The testimony of those who lived in the earlier centuries is conflicting; neither is it important for us to know. The only reliable authorities in the case, are Jesus Christ and his Apostles; and since they did not authorize the baptism of infants, it is, therefore, anti-christian. There is no consistency in baptizing persons before they have come to years of understanding.

An eminent pedo-baptist writer, after urging the duties of church-membership upon the unbaptized, then adds, that special attention should be given to those who have been admitted to visible membership in their infancy, and have attained to the age when it is their duty publicly to profess the religion of Jesus before the Church and the world by *confirming*, or taking upon themselves the vows made at their baptism in infancy. The same author urges the validity of infant baptism upon the ground that if the children of believing parents were not baptized and admitted to visible church membership, there would be a *peculiar class of persons*, the *unbaptized offspring* of believing parents. He says, "This class would by birth be

within the visible church, and yet by the denial of its initiatory ordinance, be without it." Such reasoning exposes the evil of infant membership. Does not every one know that the children of Christian parents are by nature carnal and sinful as well as others are, and need repentance and regeneration as well? They have the same need of awakening to a knowledge of their sins and of their need of a Savior as have the unbaptized. Herein lies one of the great evils of this practice. The baptized children are under the instruction and guidance of the church, comforted on that account with a promise of the blessing, and if they grow up fairly moral and well disposed, they will attend worship and believe and practice the creed of the church, and all this they will do without a true, saving knowledge of the requirements of the New Testament. The call from heaven to man has ever been, "Repent and be baptized," "Repent and be converted," "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." These scriptures convey the idea of a state of sin, and a duty to God, and a need of a Savior, and must be heard, and experienced, and obeyed by everyone who desires salvation, and are designed to apply to everyone; but we must ask, when do they apply to the youthful, responsible, members of the pedo-baptist faith? Again, Christ's commission to his Apostles instructs us to teach and then baptize upon faith, which comports with all the scripture teaching; but how can anyof this accord with infant baptism. Those who defend this

doctrine must claim that the infant-baptized members, on account of their baptism, are always under grace, and never come under the moral law as its transgressors, and so do not commit sin to be repented of; hence they do not need the service of that law as their school-master to bring them to Christ. Now if they enjoy a blessing above the unbaptized on account of their church relation, we should witness the fruits of it in a better life; but as they grow up in sin, and live after the flesh as the others do, we must believe that their baptismal vow is no help to them, and it certainly does not change their relation to their God. "It is better not to vow, than to vow and not to pay."

It would seem out of place for us to again be necessitated to call attention to the one great object of Christ's mission upon earth, which was to unbar the way to Paradise, which he did by healing the breach made by sin, and thus satisfying divine justice. We have thereby been set free from the consequences of Adam's transgression, and are no more fettered by the judgment of a broken law, only we inherit the consequent effect of sin in our mortal, sinful bodies. This is a standing testimony of man's utter helplessness, and an unceasing appeal to his conscience to be reconciled with God through the means provided. As this can be active only after we attain to an age when we can discern between good and evil; so we are not accountable before that age, but are saved by the merits of Christ. We read that he blessed little children

and said, "Of such are the kingdom of heaven." He did not baptize them, nor did he command them to be baptized, and yet he could pronounce the blessing of peace upon them. His calls to the unconverted all convey the force and necessity of rational, reflecting thought. Nothing to convey the idea that one should stand as sponsor for another. There is but one way of salvation indicated, and that is by conviction, repentance, faith and regeneration, and these must be experienced individually and not by proxy. Each of us stands accountable to God for himself in these exercises, and no one can answer for another. The Apostle tells us that "without faith it is impossible to please God;" and we should all know that the faith of one cannot by any effort of the mind be made to be active to the saving of another. We can all accept that if one person can not exercise active, living faith to the salvation of his soul, no one else can for him, and any ordinance administered upon him would not change his condition. The same is true of the innocent, unconscious child. Until it attains to the age of discretion, it has the same sure word of promise as has the most faithful servant of the Master; and as we can assume nothing for a person after he attains to the age of accountability, so we can do nothing, and need do nothing for him before that time. If Christ expiated the guilt of Adam's transgressions, surely the innocent child should share the fruits of it, at least as fully as the wilful sinner who turns and hopefully seeks salvation through the merits of Christ's redemption. If Christ's

atonement does not save little children without the observance of baptism, surely it will not with it; for baptism can be properly and consistently administered only upon rational, intelligent persons. We might here ask, what does the baptism of little children signify? What does it effect? The Apostle Peter tells us that the import of baptism is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God." Will this apply to infants? Can they be said to have the answer of a conscience? They know nothing of either a good or a bad conscience. Is not the conscience of a child as latent as are its intellectual powers? When do we need conscience? When we reach an age of accountability, and then God in his mercy develops it as he does the mind. The Apostle James, says, "He that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin." What is the good referred to here? There is nothing good but what emanates from God. We must then conclude that the good referred to by the Apostle is that service to God, of which his convicting grace, as soon as we can realize the consequences of sin, and our accountability to him, will convict us by prompting us to flee his wrath and seek shelter under "the Rock that is higher than I." As none of this service or duty, can be rendered by innocent children, certainly they have no accountability.

There is much said and written about the duty and obligation of parents and sponsors to their children or wards, that they bring them up under the nurture of the church,

not only by enlisting their affections for the church of their choice, but by such helps as the Sunday School, Christian Endeavor, and other kindred accessories. To this we would say, *far better teach them that they are sinners.* Far better teach them that they should honor the convicting grace of God by rendering obedience to his will, that they may have hope of the pardon of their sins. All Christian parents will admonish and instruct their children in the fear of the Lord. They will teach them to be respectful and truthful; and, we repeat, above all, teach them that they are sinners, and have need of repentance and regeneration by faith in Christ. They seek to set them a good example in conduct and conversation; but they by no means urge them to join the church, since the church cannot give them life; but they urge them to come to Christ and obtain pardon from sin, that they may receive spiritual life; then they will come to the church.

The Mode of Baptism.

This subject has perplexed many honest enquirers after truth. It has been the occasion of much controversy. Our Baptist friends maintain that there is no mode of baptism but immersion acceptable to God and approved in his word. This view has only been held since the seventeenth century. During some of the preceding centuries of the Christian Era, notably during the sixteenth, there was much controversy as to the subjects to whom baptism should be administered, but not as to the mode of administration. In that century, thousands of the most devoted

followers of the Lord Jesus whom the world ever knew, offered up their lives for the cause of the truth. They were opposed to infant baptism; but relative to the mode of administration, there appears to have been no issue. It is remarkable that in such an age as that of the reformation, when there were so many heated controversies upon so many different subjects, and among them the subject of baptism, that we find no question raised as to the *mode*, although we have reliable historical information that, at least in previous centuries, different modes were practised.

It is evident that the sentiment now held by the German and the English Baptists, that immersion is the only right mode of baptism, was not then entertained. Of those who suffered matyrdom during the sixteenth century, there was a considerable number who were baptized in private dwellings. Numbers confessed in their examination before inquisitors that they were so baptized. In that time Menno Simon lived and labored most devotedly for the promulgation of sound doctrine, and for the salvation of souls. He could not have been ignorant of the fact that persons whom he recognized as fellow believers were baptized in houses; and since we find no protest in his writings against such baptism, we conclude that that faithful servant of the Lord did not hold the doctrine that immersion alone is baptism. When the confession and pure lives of those people, as recorded in history, is duly considered, the impression is made that they followed the Lamb whithersoever he led them, were redeemed from among men,

and had the name of their Lord written on their foreheads.

Baptists maintain that the word *baptize* signifies to immerse, and little else. *Baptize* is the anglicized form of the Greek word *baptizo.* Many men, eminent for learning, are quoted as authority by Baptists, that the original word for baptism means to dip, to plunge, and to submerge. On the other hand, pedo-baptists claim some of those same men as authority for *pour*, *sprinkle*, *bathe*, etc. In addition to these, they cite many other authorities to prove that baptize not only means to immerse, but also, to pour and to sprinkle. Some authorities give immersion, pouring, sprinkling, perfusion, or washing in any way. Luther's German translation from the Greek renders the world *tauffen ;* whereas, if baptize signified only immersion, it should have been rendered *eintauchen.* Dr. Miller, formerly of Princeton College, said to have been one of the best Greek scholars of his time, is quoted as follows: "I can assure you that the word which is rendered baptizo, does legitimately signify the application of water in any way as well as by immersion. I can assure you if the most mature and competent Greek scholars that ever lived, may be allowed to decide in this case, that many examples of the use of this word occur in scripture in which it not only *may*, but *must* signify sprinkling, perfusion, or washing in any way." In Menno Simon's admonition to scorners of water baptism, this language occurs; "How any one who refuses God a *handful* of water can conform himself to love his enemies." Again,

the following expression is found in his writings upon baptism; "than to have a handful of water applied." But this same author is claimed by the advocates of immersion. In his comple works, page 204, is found the following: "For however industriously we may search day and night, we yet find but one baptism in the water pleasing to God, which is expressed and contained in his word." Again, on page 231, "Let all the world under the heavens oppose in every way in which they are able, this is the only mode of baptism which Jesus Christ himself instituted, and the Apostles taught and practised." Any one taking the pains to read the context to these two extracts, will readily perceive that the author had no reference to the *mode* of administering the ordinance, but only to whom it should be administered—to believing adults, and not to infants.

Baptists quote largely from the early history of the church, and a strong effort is made to trace immersion back to the times of the Apostles through these writings. So far there seems to be nothing reliable found on record concerning the mode practised during the first and part of the second century. Aside from the fact that the use of one mode prevailed in general for a time, and then another mode in the same way, it seems that all the established modes were practised more or less all the time. We cannot commend the too common practice of the advocates of one mode quoting only such authors as supported that particular mode, to the almost entire exclusion

of opposing testimony. Neither can we accept as reliable all that is quoted, since there seems to be an almost unlimited amount of evidence to support any of the modes; and it occurs very often that assertions are made but not proven. How can a writer of the fourth or sixth century state so positively, as many do, that a certain mode prevailed since the days of the Apostles, or was commanded by Christ and his Apostles, and still give no proof of it by quoting from the writings of those who lived in the first and second centuries? That they quote nothing, is conclusive proof that nothing was written then that was extant in the time of these writers. It is well authenticated that there was a general decline of the church, as was foretold by the Apostles and witnessed by John in the Revelations, and which increased until darkness generally prevailed; so we must accept most of what is written with a degree of allowance; for how can the cause of Christ be advanced by using testimony of any sect or people who are not fully in accord with gospel teaching, and who do not show forth in their faith and practise those fruits which heaven designed as a witness to the world that Christ has sent them.

We find in the *Martyrs' Mirror*, which is a compilation from various authentic chronicles and testimonials, giving an account of the faith, doctrine and sufferings of the defenseless Christians during sixteen hundred years, that baptism was frequently administered in the water, and there are repeated instances where it is expressly

stated that they immersed the applicants, but we have found but one instance of trine immersion in the work. Then on the other side we find Cyprian of the fourth century quoted as saying, "The sprinkling with water is of equal validity with the laver." Eucherius says, "The victim is washed when a believer is sprinkled with the water of baptism." About the year 250, Urian, Macellinus and Justin were drawn to the Christian religion. They were baptized by a minister named Justin, who rejoiced that such learned men should bow to the yoke of Jesus. He instructed them, and afterwards had water brought and baptized them on confession of their faith. This circumstance would indicate these were not baptized by immersion. There is also allusion made to the fact that persons who were dangerously ill, or as it is stated in some places, "very sick," were baptized, but evidently not by immersion. When brought before the inquisitors, many testified that they were baptized in the houses of some of their brethren. In the fourth century, Optatus Mile Vitanus, in giving instruction to Catechumens upon the ordinance of baptism, used these words: "We know that in the observance of baptism, there are three essential points; the first relates to the holy Trinity; the second, to the believers; and the third, to the baptizer." The mode was not named in the consideration of what is important in baptism; and as we do not find in the entire work a single controversy about the mode, we have reason to believe that it was not disputed, although it is very evident that different modes were practised.

It is worthy of notice that in many of the explanations of baptism during the early centuries there is more virtue ascribed to water baptism than the scriptures warrant. It is called the "bath of regeneration," and esteemed as the means essential to the forgiveness of sin. During the sixth century we find sentiments like these freely expressed: "The souls of the elect, or baptized, have lost in baptism the impurity of the old man, and are made new in Christ." "Baptism is a divine fountain in which believers are regenerated, and become new creatures." "And is washed by baptism from the pollution of sin." Such sentiments are evidence of ascribing too much virtue to an outward ordinance; and always show a lack of the true import of baptism, and of the true knowledge of regeneration. As a fruit of the veneration in which baptism, and particularly immersion, was held during the earlier centuries, there were some practices associated with the administration of it that were wholly without scriptural warrant. Among these were nude immersions and the putting on of white robes after baptism, both of which, it is said, were practised more or less by the Catholic, Greek and Protestant churches; and were defended on the ground that they represented the putting off the sins of the flesh, and the putting on of the righteousness of Christ. When we find such manifestation of a legal spirit, either in the use of, or in the mode of administering and observing the ordinances or in attaching too much importance to the outward expression to the neglect of the

divine life, we must conclude that such are evidences of a state of darkness. During the sixteenth century when the church of Christ stood so valiantly for the truth, and left on record such bright and inspiring examples of the power of living, saving faith, we find no such sentiments ascribing saving virtue to an outward ordinance, neither controversy about the mode. It is remarkable how sound were the faith and practice of the believers during that trying time.

We could obtain almost unlimited evidence from encyclopedias and theological works, in support of either immersion, or pouring, but such additional information would increase the size of this tract beyond our desire; and at best would but be the testimony of men. As honest enquirers after truth, we cannot settle anything definitely as to the word *baptizo*; since learned men do not agree as to its limitations. There is agreement that it means to dip and immerse, but there is not agreement that it does not also mean perfusion, pouring and sprinkling. From the practice of professed Christian teachers who have lived in the past, we can learn nothing conclusive; as different modes have been practised by different persons at different times. It will therefore be best for us to confine ourselves as closely to the Scriptures as possible.

John's Baptism, Not Christian Baptism.

John was a herald of the Savior. His baptism was preparatory to the receiving of Christ as the Savior of

sinners. He testified, "That Christ should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water"; "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord." He directed his disciples to believe on him who should come after him. His baptism came between the law and the gospel. It was representative of sorrow for sin, and of repentance; and was practised under the legal dispensation; as the law was not yet fulfilled, the great sacrifice for sin was not yet offered, the typical sacrifice had not ceased, and the time for the practice of gospel ordinances had not yet come. As his ministration was under the law, therefore, his baptism was not an ordinance under the gospel, but under the law.

The Levites were a figure or representation of John's disciples. They were inferior to the priests in their calling; and their duties were preparatory to the service of the priests, as John's ministration was preparatory to the office of spiritual priests in Christ's kingdom. To qualify the Levites for their service, the Lord said to Moses, "And thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them; sprinkle water of purifying upon them." John's ministration effected a moral reformation in man. The test was, "Bring forth fruits meet for repentance." As an expression and a representation of such a change, he baptized his disciples with water. As the Levites were sprinkled with the water of purification to qualify them for their office; may not John also have applied water to

those who came to him confessing their sins? The Levites were plainly a figure of John's disciples; and, as they were sprinkled with water, it would not well coincide with the figure, if John immersed his disciples. That his baptism was distinct from Christian baptism, becomes the more apparent when we consider Paul's counsel to those twelve men whom he met at Ephesus; who had received John's baptism. He asked them, "Have you received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" They replied, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." He then asked them, "Unto what then were ye baptized?" They answered, "Unto John's baptism." Paul replied, "John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him who should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." (Acts 19.) It has been asserted that those men were not baptized by an authorized disciple of John; and hence Paul's act of re-baptizing them. Such claim is not sustained by the Apostle's reasoning. He stated facts to them concerning the design of John's baptism, making a distinction between it and Christian baptism.

We have no evidence that John baptized by immersion. It is recorded that he baptized near to Enon, because there was much water there. Dr. Smucher, in his *Popular Theology*, renders it *many springs*. He also argues that plenty of water was a necessity for the comfort of the

people who assembled in such large numbers in that desert country. He maintains that this is why it is stated, "there was much water there." Such reasoning is not groundless when it is remembered that, "Then went out to him, Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the regions round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." (Math. 3:5,6.) The language, "There was much water there," determines nothing as to the mode of baptism. John had been baptizing at, or in the Jordan river, where there was no doubt water enough to enable him to baptize by immersion, if such was his mode. There can be no reliable inference drawn from his baptizing near Enon, as to the mode practiced.

Baptism of Christ.

Christ coming to John to be baptized of him, teaches us the impressive lesson of obedience. Some of our friends see nothing in Christ's baptism, but an outward form for us to copy after. His language is very impressive; "It becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." There was certainly more involved than *being baptized.* It is certainly a righteous administration that will produce these results, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. Every valley shall be filled, and every mountain and hill shall be brought low; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough ways shall be made smooth; and all flesh shall see the salvation of God." (Luke 3:4—6.) "And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to

the fathers." (Mal. 4:6.) Christ had no need of any service that implied moral impurity; yet, as the son of man, and as our ransom, he became like nnto us, sin excepted. Being under the law he was circumcised, and he also kept the passover, which typified his atonement. So he also honored the just ministration of John by obedience to its form; and as a lesson of obedience to us that we should honor God's economy by yielding obedience to the calls of his grace; that we may thereby attain to redemption by having our hearts prepared by a knowledge of sin, which we attain through the law; and also by becoming willing to forsake unrighteousness, which the mission of John represents; and thus be prepared to receive that kingdom which Christ came to establish in our hearts, and which is characterized by love and peace. John said, "I indeed baptize you *with* water"; which, if our translation is correct, would indicate that John applied water to those whom he baptized, and did not practise immersion.

Our Baptist friends insist that as John baptized in the Jordan, and our Savior was baptized by him, so we also should follow his example, and as he went into the water to be baptized, so should we. They couple with this that baptism is essential to the remission of sin, and that there is no baptism but immersion. We are persuaded that many poor souls are misled by such teaching. One writer goes so far as to argue that John and our Savior both taught the same doctrine and baptized with the same

baptism. He would make it appear that John baptized Christ according to the Apostolic commission, which would baptize him in his own name. This may all seem plausible; but John could not have baptized in the name of Christ, for Christ was not yet revealed as the Messiah when John began to baptize, and his ministry was nearly finished when he baptized our Savior. And surely he could not have baptized into the death of Christ, which the Apostle Paul, in Rom. 6, shows to be one of the significant expressions of Christian baptism. Christ's own disciples could not, even after many efforts by our Savior, be made to comprehend the necessity nor the import of his death; and only after witnessing it, and receiving subsequent instruction upon it, and being enlightened by the gift of the Holy Ghost, could they at all realize it and teach it to others. Then wherein would be the propriety of considering John's baptism as embracing it? Neither could he have baptized in the name of the Holy Ghost, for he himself, to make a clear distinction between his dispensation and that of Christ, testified, "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." If then he could not have baptized in the name of Christ, nor in that of the Holy Ghost, he must not have baptized in any name, but simply with water *unto repentance*, as always stated. This all proves his baptism to be distinct from Christian baptism, for it could not in any sense represent what Christian baptism represents.

Our Savior testified of John, that "Among them that are born of women, there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist, notwithstanding, he that is least in the Kingdom of heaven is greater than he." This plainly shows John's relation both to the law and to the kingdom; for he that is least in the kingdom, that is, in the fulness of the blessings of the Gospel of Peace, is greater than John, then surely John could not have been in the kingdom, and under these blessings. Another reason why he could not have been under the Gospel, or in the kingdom, is because the Gospel was yet unknown to man, and the kingdom of Christ was not yet established. Christ could not yet be said to have established his kingdom, or church, before he completed the redemption, before he "took the armor from the strong man armed," before he burst the bars of death and achieved the victory over death, hell and the grave. Where would be the consistency in maintaining that his kingdom, or church, should begin with the preaching of John and be continued by his own ministry, to be manifested in its power on the day of Pentecost, as many suppose. The Scriptures testify that Christ was put under the law to fulfil it, which was effected only when he expiated our guilt upon the cross, saying, "it is finished." He must obey the law in all its spiritual requirements by his holy life; and, as without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin, so he must offer up his body as the great atoning sacrifice. His kingdom is a spiritual kingdom

set up in the hearts of his people; and that kingdom could not be established until the powers of darkness were subverted, and the faithful set free from their dominion. The prophet Isaiah (chap. 28 : 16) writes, "I lay in Zion for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation." That stone was Christ, but he was not that "tried stone" until his work was finished, his redemption wrought. Nor until then could he be that "sure foundation," nor that "stone which became the head of the corner." This is all figurative, as is also the reference of Paul and Peter to Christ as the "chief corner stone," upon which the church was to be established. But, to be a true figure, Christ's ministry and atonement must precede the building of the church.

John comprehended comparatively little even of what he spoke concerning Christ, and as little or less of his kingdom; and how could he have taught the doctrine of that kingdom. He understood as little of his own words when he said, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world," and also, "he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire," as did Mary, the mother of Jesus, and the aged Simeon when they spoke of him prophetically. If Christ's own disciples under his personal, daily teaching attained to no definite knowledge of their Master, nor of his kingdom, what ground have we for expecting more of John than of them. After witnessing the divine attestation of the Messiahship of Christ at his baptism, and having knowledge of his miraculous

power and deeds of mercy, John must send from the prison by his disciples to inquire personally of Jesus, "Art thou he that should come; or look we for another?" If he had so little certain knowledge of the Savior and of his mission, how could it be said that he taught the same doctrine with Christ, and baptized with the same baptism?

There is but one satisfactory way to account for the baptism of John, and also that by the disciples of Christ, whom he sent out to preach and heal, and that is that they all stood upon a common plane. The work was all preliminary, and was designed to prepare a people for the Lord. They made one common appeal to all everywhere to repent, and baptized *unto repentance* all who accepted their word. If the preaching of Christ's disciples during his ministry was under the new or Gospel dispensation, why were they not qualified to preach after the resurrection, and after much personal teaching by our Savior during the forty days, about "the things pertaining to the kingdom of God?" They were commanded to tarry at Jerusalem until indued with power from on high, before they could preach the Gospel of the kingdom. It is quite evident that this preliminary work by John and the disciples of Christ could not have saved a single soul unless supplemented by the great redemption wrought by Christ. Hence we see the great inconsistency of calling John's baptism Christian baptism, and of using it to establish a mode of Christian baptism, or to prove that baptism should be administered in the water.

Christian baptism was first administered upon the day of Pentecost. Until then no one could be consistently baptized in the names of the *Trinity ;* for *before that time*, the Holy Ghost was not given as an abiding, regenerating principle. Christ said to his disciples, " I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever ; even the spirit of truth ; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." (John 14 : 16, 17.) " Christ was not yet glorified, and the Holy Ghost was not yet given." (John 7 : 39.) From these scriptures and others, it is plain that no one under the law possessed the Holy Spirit ; not even the disciples before the appointed time. Through the powerful preaching upon the day of Pentecost, when the Apostles were indued with power from on high, many persons were convicted of the great sin they were guilty of in crucifying the Lord Jesus, and said, " Men and brethren what shall we do." Peter replied, " Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. Then they that gladly received his word were baptized ; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." (Acts 2 : 38–40). We have no circumstantial evidence that these were baptized by immersion. It is certainly very doubtful whether they were. We will not argue that the time would have been too short, and the number of baptizers too few to immerse so many persons. If our Baptist friends are right, that im-

mersion alone is baptism, then it could have been, and was accomplished; for the Lord always provides ways and means for the performance of his will. But it should impress every reflecting mind, that the position of those who maintain that there is no mode of baptism but immersion, is a very responsible one. If they are supported by the word of God, they are on safe ground; but if not, they will have to give account at the day of judgment for having added to the Lord's revealed will.

It is noteworthy that among those who maintain that immersion alone is baptism, there is a great lack of unity as to the manner of administration. There have been warm and animated controversies between the trine and the single immersionists; and if those debaters who have been put upon record are sincere, then one rejects the baptism of the other, although both parties immerse. One tires of reading the controversy, it is so void of spirituality. Then, again, there is another class of immersionists who contend earnestly that the right way to baptize is to immerse backward, as a forward action does not represent a burial. These divisions are the legitimate fruits of legalism. Have we not reason to believe that if the *mode* of baptism was so important, as many think it is, that a merciful Heavenly Father would have plainly indicated that mode in his word? Under the law, all the ceremonies were so plainly described, and the manner of attending to them so specifically given, that there could be no mistake; and if the mode of baptism is so impor-

tant, why are we left in doubt as to the *right* mode. The duties pertaining to the Christian life are so well defined in the Gospel, that no sincere person can mistake them. The love, the peace, and the purity of the Christian heart are clearly defined; and the unity, the peace, and the purity of the church are so plainly taught and illustrated under the new dispensation, that no one desiring the truth can fail to find it. But as to outward forms, there is so little written. For the administration of baptism, there is no specific rule given whether it shall be administered in the house of worship, or in, or at, a flowing stream; whether *with* water or *under* the water; neither whether it shall be at any stated time. Also in the observance of the Lord's Supper, neither the day, nor the time of day, nor the month of the year is named when it shall be observed. It is not written whether communicants shall receive the symbols of Christ's body and blood, standing or sitting; neither whether leavened, or unleavened bread shall be used.

The reason the ordinances and ceremonies under the law were so carefully described as to time, place, and quantity, as well as the kind of service, and the kind of offering required, was because they had but the shadow of the good things to come. They prefigured and symbolized the atonement of Christ. But, under the Gospel we have the body—the abiding reality; wherefore, its ordinances represent not that which is to come, but that which has come, viz., Christ and his kingdom. That

which is expressed by baptism and by the communion has previously been experienced by all who are proper persons to receive baptism, and to partake of the communion. For this reason so little importance is attached to forms and modes under the Gospel dispensation; and that so much is recorded therein pertaining to the life and character of believers. ' True worshipers now worship the Father in spirit and in truth; and to that end they must possess the spirit of Christ.

To resume the subject of the mode of baptism, we will refer to the case of Philip and the Ethiopian eunuch. In that case it is to be observed that both Philip and the eunuch went down into the water, and came up out of the water. This is the only circumstance recorded in the New Testament where it is stated that baptism was administered in the water. As they were journeying, and while Philip was preaching to the eunuch, they passed by water; and the eunuch said, "Here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized." This last circumstance is claimed as evidence that Philip preached baptism; and also that a body, or stream of water is essential to the administration of baptism; that Philip and the eunuch both went *into* the water; and, after baptism, both came up *out* of the water. The fact of both having gone *into* the water does not determine the mode; for we do not know what depth of water was there: and that they came up out of the water determines nothing as to the mode, since they both did the same. If the fact of their going *into* the

water, and coming up *out* of the water proves that the eunuch was *under* the water, it will also prove that Philip was *under* the water. Neither does the language of the eunuch, "See, here is water," prove that Philip taught him the necessity of being baptized in a body of water, or in a stream. We are not in position to judge correctly of their situation; it may have been more convenient for them to go to the water than to have water brought to them. We know nothing of the circumstances except the brief record referred to; but one thing is evident, that we are not warranted in concluding that Philip baptized the eunuch by immersion.

In Acts 9:18 an account is given of the baptism of Paul. It is very brief. "He arose and was baptized." We can gather no evidence from this language that he went to a stream of water to be baptized. He evidently was weak, bodily, for he did not eat nor drink for three days. He may have been reclining, and simply arose from such position. At least we can infer nothing more than that he changed his position, or situation, and not his location. In Paul's relation of his conversion and baptism, Acts 22:16, occurs the following: "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." Here again occurs the word *arise;* but it is not stated that he was told to arise and go somewhere. Ananias, after having fully instructed Paul, and having assured him of his calling from the Lord to be a chosen vessel to carry the glad tidings

of salvation to the nations, said to him, "Why tarriest thou;" as though he would have said, Brother Saul, since you have such full proof of God's gracious favor toward you in the forgiveness of all your sins, and of your adoption, why delay to make a public profession of the same by receiving the ordinance of baptism, which is a representation of your having been washed and cleansed from your sins by the blood of Christ. In this connection it should be borne in mind that water baptism is expressive of the washing of regeneration, or the cleansing of a believer's soul from moral pollution by the baptism of the Holy Ghost; that under the law the bloody sacrifices pointed to the death of Christ; and that the blood of sprinkling was expressive of the forgiveness of sin by faith in his atoning sacrifice upon the cross. The washings, or purifyings, symbolized the efficacy of the Holy Ghost as a purifying and cleansing power. It was in *this* sense that Ananias addressed Paul, saying, "be baptized and wash away thy sins;" for he certainly did not mean that the water used in baptism would wash away sin. The blood of Christ alone cleanses from sin.

In the tenth chapter of Acts, we have an account of the conversion of Cornelius, his kinsmen, and his friends, and of their baptism. After witnessing the effect of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, Peter said, "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord."

There is nothing in this confirmatory of immersion. "*Who can forbid water*" does not convey the idea of going to a stream of water, but rather that of having water brought and applied to the subjects.

In Acts 16:13-15, we have an account of the instruction given by Paul and Timothy to certain women who resorted to a river where prayer was wont to be made, and of Lydia's conversion; also of the baptism of her and her household. Nothing is here recorded that gives information as to the mode. The object of going to the river was not for the purpose of being baptized. It appears to have been a suitable place for retirement and devotion.

In the latter part of the same chapter, we have an account of the imprisonment of Paul and Silas, and of the conversion and baptism of the jailor and of his household. The charge to the jailor was, "keep them safely." "He thrust them into the inner prison and made their feet fast in stocks." At midnight Paul and Silas sang and prayed, when an earthquake ensued. The doors were opened, and the bands fell from the prisoners. The jailor supposing that the prisoners had all fled, was about to take his own life, when Paul called to him, "Do thyself no harm, we are all here." The jailor became so thoroughly convinced of the divine calling of Paul and Silas, and of *his* unsaved state, that he made haste to come before them, and falling down he exclaimed, "what must I do to be saved." They spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all who were in his house. The same hour of the

night, the jailor washed their stripes, "and was baptized, he and all his." After his confession of sin before Paul and Silas, he brought them out; evidently out of the cell or inner prison. After they were brought out, they preached; then followed the washing of their stripes by the jailor, and after that, baptism. Baptists claim that they must have been outside of the building, or else there would be no meaning in the language "and when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them." We do not know how the prison was arranged, neither as to the relation of the jailor's house to the prison. Both may have been included under one roof, and composed one building; and yet the jailor's house, or apartment, may have been separate from the jail proper. The probability is that Paul and Silas were brought out of the inner prison into which they had been thrust the previous evening, into the main apartment of the jail; and from there went into the jailor's house. It is not said that they left the house that night, for the next morning they were still prisoners. Paul, at Jerusalem, announced his Roman citizenship in advance, doubtless to escape bodily suffering, which was divinely ordained so; but he and Silas did not resort to this means at Phillippi; but were willing to endure all things for Christ's sake, and for the advancement of his glorious kingdom; no doubt having evidences within themselves that it was the Lord's will; as it proved to be the means of the conversion of the jailor and his house. All the circumstances attending their conversion point strongly to the

conclusion that Paul and Silas did not go to a stream of water to baptize them. If the jailor would have done so, he would have violated his obligation of guarding the prisoners, and would have incurred punishment. Let us not lose sight of the fact that under the gospel the quantity of water in baptism is not stated, only the use of water; also that there is but one instance recorded where baptism was administered in the water, whereas there are a number of baptisms recorded where the circumstances would indicate that they were not performed in the water.

Cleansings Under the Old Testament.

In Numbers 19:18, we have the law for the purification of the unclean, "And a clean person shall take hyssop, and dip it in water, and sprinkle it upon the tent, and upon all the vessels, and upon the persons that were there, and upon him that touched a bone, or one slain, or one dead, or a grave." Similiar language is found in Leviticus 14:6-7, with reference to the cleansing of one who had recovered from leprosy. The prophet Ezekiel referring to the rejection of Israel for their sins, and their restoration through mercy, says, "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you." To cleanse the Levites, Moses was commanded to "sprinkle water of purifying upon them." He was also commanded to anoint the tabernacle, and the altar and all the vessels with anointing oil to sanctify them; and to consecrate Aaron and his sons, he was to take of the anointing oil and of the blood which

was upon the altar, and sprinkle it upon Aaron and upon his garments, and upon his sons and upon their garments. These were all most important services, and all by sprinkling or by pouring; and they all pointed to Him of whom the prophet Isaiah, in contemplating the exalting of Christ's kingdom and of its attendant blessings, uses this language, "So shall he sprinkle many nations," The varied legal ablutions with water are called baptisms by Paul in Hebrew 6, and are symbolic of the cleansing of the heart by faith in Christ, whether consisting in an entire washing of the body, or only a portion of it. We have evidence that the virtue is not in the element, but in the word and spirit of the Lord; and that cleansing and purifying can be as well represented by the application of a small quantity of water, or any other element, as by a large quantity.

Baptism of the Holy Ghost by Pouring.

The spiritual baptism was symbolized by the anointing of the high priest with oil. "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. It is like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard; that went down to the skirts of his garments." (Ps. 133). Aaron and his sons and the high priests after them, were anointed by pouring upon their heads an holy anointing oil, which was not to be used for any common purpose. This sacred oil was a type of the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit. The high priest was especially a type of Christ; and the anoint-

ing was a type of the Holy Ghost descending upon Christ, when he received the public recognition of his Heavenly Father in these words, "This is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased." Since all believers are members of Christ, and have his spirit, they are also anointed with the same anointing wherewith he was anointed. The holy oil poured upon Aaron's head went down to the skirts of his garments; so likewise the Holy Ghost came upon the great High Priest, Jesus Christ, and descended upon every member of his body. The *pouring upon* of the Holy Spirit, is called a baptism, Joel 2; "I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh." The Apostle Peter, upon the day of Pentecost, quoted the above prophecy from the beginning of the 28th verse until near the close of the 31st. In his exposition of the prophecy, he applies it to what was then transpiring at Jerusalem. The promise was fulfilled by the Holy Ghost being poured upon the Apostles and disciples; and by the manifestation of its power in the regeneration of all who were brought under its sanctifying influence. Then was accomplished the prediction of John the Baptist; "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." "And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost." The cloven tongues, as of fire, were representative of the varied gifts, and of the fervor and undying zeal of regenerated souls. Being filled with the Holy Ghost was expressive of the fulness of the grace of God in the hearts of believers, as

our Lord testified to the Samaritan woman, "It shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life."

Advocates of immersion claim that those upon the day of Pentecost were immersed in the Holy Ghost, since the whole house was filled. It is written, "suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing, mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting." It was the *sound* that filled the house; but the Apostles were filled with the Holy Ghost. (Acts 2:2-4.)

Jesus Christ has made his redeemed ones kings and priests unto God and unto the Father, as foreshadowed and typified by the kings and priests under the law, being anointed with the holy oil poured upon their heads; which anointing was a type of the spiritual baptism by the Holy Ghost poured upon believers. *Pouring, therefore, is baptism.* If the "pouring upon," and "falling upon," of the Holy Ghost upon believers is called baptism, who then is authorized to say that the pouring of water upon the head of a believer is not baptism?

Christ's suffering is called a baptism. His suffering consisted mainly in bearing the sins of the world, and being forsaken of God, of angels, and of man. To attempt to get a ground for the mode of baptism from Christ's suffering, is certaintly going too far; and to attempt to change the wording of the New Testament by substituting *immerse*, for *baptize*, is unwarranted; since in some cases where we now have baptize, immerse will not make sense. For example take the inquiry of our Savior in answer to James

and John, Mark 10:38, "Can ye * * * be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" And his reply in the 39th verse, "and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized." It would not do to substitute, "Can ye * * * be immersed with the immersion that I am immersed with?" etc.

I have recently read an argument to prove immersion from 1 Pet. 3;21, where the Apostle in speaking of Noah and his family being saved by water, calls it a figure of the baptism that now saves us. Noah and his family were not immersed in the waters of the flood; they floated above the water; and how is it possible to get a ground for immersion from the circumstance of floating upon the surface of a body of water? In the same verse the Apostle says, "Baptism is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Baptism is an outward sign of an inward, spiritual change. The answer of a good conscience is the result of a consecration of the heart and soul to God through faith in Christ, and the consequent possession of the Holy Spirit.

The advocates of immersion infer from the deluge that the ark was borne aloft by the water, which could not have occurred had there not been a large body of water; reasoning upon the basis that a birth cannot come from a body smaller than itself, and that the water was the saving means. But the argument is faulty, since the new birth does not come through a material object, or agency, but

is wrought through the energy and creative power of the Holy Ghost; and since a small quantity of either blood or water sprinkled upon the thing to be cleansed was sufficient to represent a real purification under the law, so may not likewise a small quantity of water be sufficient to represent the true import of Christian baptism?

In 1 Cor. 10:1-2, Paul writes, "Moreover brethren I would not that ye should be ignorant how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Some advocates of immersion suppose, as the Israelites had a wall of water on either side, and a cloud over their heads, they were immersed. How could the baptism of the Israelites represent a mode? We have no evidence that any water came upon them, or that their bodies were touched by water; but their enemies were overwhelmed with water, and so perished. But why was their passage through the sea called a baptism? Because the cloud and the sea were the means of their preservation and deliverance from the wrath of King Pharaoh. They were baptized unto Moses, that is, through their miraculous deliverance they were placed under increased and special obligation to obey Moses, the servant of the Lord, and their deliverer. We repeat, the reason why their passage through the sea was called a baptism was because the cloud and the sea were the means of saving them and placing them in a new relation, that of full freedom from Egyptian bondage, or servitude. The pillar of cloud stood

between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel, and was a pillar of fire to the Israelites, but was darkness to the Egyptians. The cloud determined the actions of the Israelites as to their journeyings: when it was taken up, they journeyed; and when it was not taken up, they journeyed not. The "pillar of cloud" was as "the pillar of fire," a manifestation of the presence of the Lord, and was the same cloud that "covered the tent of the congregation" at the consecration of the tabernacle (Ex. 40:34), and the same that "filled the house of the Lord" at the dedication of the temple (1 Kings, 8:10); and must not be considered as a natural cloud to complete the figure of immersion. The deliverance of the Israelites from the wrath of Pharaoh and his host, has a spiritual signification. Egyptian bondage represents the fallen race of Adam under the bondage of sin. Moses, who led them out of Egyptian bondage, represents Christ, who came to deliver sinners from the bondage of sin. The cloud and the sea are representative of the saving power of Jesus Christ by his atoning sacrifice, and by the power of his word and spirit. If we use the waters of the flood, or the cloud and the sea, to represent a form of baptism, then we use one figure to represent another figure, which is not the design of figures. They are intended to represent a reality. Being baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, may have been a figure of the spiritual baptism by which believers are baptized into Christ; and the perishing of the Egyptians, a figure of mortifying our carnal nature.

The laver of brass placed near the door of the sanctuary in which the priests washed their hands and their feet, and sometimes their whole bodies, before officiating at the altar, represented the sacredness of their service, and their need of purification. The priests were washed at their consecration, yet they were strictly commanded to wash their hands and their feet every time they officiated at the altar; which signified their liability to contract defilement; and represents the true laver, Jesus Christ, as a merciful High Priest, who is at the right hand of the Father interceding for the saints. The repeated ablutions of the priests do not establish a mode of baptism, yet some of our friends maintain they do, and that is why we have referred to it.

Great stress is laid upon the figurative language of the Apostle Paul as recorded in Romans 6:5-7. The Apostle had been unfolding and bringing to view the fulness and freeness of *the grace* through which redemption was secured, by demonstrating the wonderful provision made for the salvation of sinners; that, notwithstanding the prevalence of sin in the world, there was grace offered that would enable all who would accept it, to gain the victory over sin, and attain to the righteousness which is by faith. In consideration of his representation of salvation by grace alone, he apprehended there would be those who would conclude that if salvation is of entire mercy and not dependent upon works, they had license to commit sin. Therefore, he says, "God forbid: How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?" The Apostle pro-

ceeds to show what he means by being dead to sin, by introducing three figures. *First*, a death and burial; *Second*, a planting; *Third*, a crucifixion. "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" It is doubtful whether the Apostle had any reference to water baptism. To be baptized into Christ implies being dead unto sin. Christ died to destroy sin, and to give power to overcome it. Since he died for our sins, we must become dead unto sin, in order to be baptized into his death. We can only be baptized into Christ and into his death by his life giving spirit, which he communicates to his children." "For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body. If the Apostle had reference to water baptism, it could only have been as symbolizing that baptism which "purges thoroughly the floor" (or heart); and "gathers his wheat into the garner" (or covenant of grace); and "burns up the chaff" (consuming the corrupt desires). The spiritual baptism, as a purifying water, washes away the internal pollutions of sin; and, as a refining fire, consumes the dross of corrupt nature. "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death;" evidently into a death to sin. Persons who die and are buried cease to live the life which they lived while in the body. According to the figure of burial, we learn that having previously been baptized into Christ by *dying unto sin*, and *now*, being dead unto sin, we are buried by baptism into death; evidently into that death which we died, which was a death to sin; and, therefore,

we are now buried by baptism with Christ into death. That is, *yesterday, today and for all time ;* for having died unto sin, we bury it and cease to live in it. And all the possible relation that water baptism can have to such a change, is the representation of it. The body that is to die, and be buried, is our corrupt and sinful life ; and no mode of baptism can represent that death and burial.

" For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." In this figure the same work of grace, and the same change as that in the *first figure*, is represented by planting. This figure may have been taken from the natural planting of seed in the ground. The seed that is planted perishes, and a new body and life is produced. " Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone ; but, if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." (John 12 : 24). Christ might have possessed his heavenly glory without becoming incarnate ; and, even after having come in human form, he need not have suffered death on his own account ; for having been justified in the spirit, he could have enjoyed without us, the glory he had with the Father from the beginning ; but to save us, he died and was buried. He died for our sins, and arose for our justification. He was put to death in the flesh, and quickened in the spirit, through which he now imparts spiritual life unto us who believe. As a grain of corn or wheat brings no increase unless it be buried in the ground where it perishes, and a new body and life is

produced; so, likewise, must we die to our carnal will, and by faith receive Christ into our hearts; who, by his spirit, will beget in us a new life. When Christ died, he died unto sin (for our sin); but he now liveth to die no more; so we die to all sin for which he died. But "having been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection"; that is, we cease from sin and live unto holiness. The figure of planting, or of being planted, is representative of spiritual union with Christ, and of obtaining spiritual life from him. Such union is attainable only by living faith, the fruits of which are separation from sin. The figure of planting is frequent in the Bible. Trees are used to represent persons. "Like a tree planted by the rivers of water." (Ps. 1.) The representation is that of spiritual union with the Lord by faith, and of being nourished by the Holy Spirit.

"Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed." If we are crucified with him, we also should be buried with him. If any one of the three figures is to be understood literally, then this one must also be so understood. Paul writes, "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." (Gal. 2:20). Here is presented a death, and a life; and the death must precede the life. The obvious meaning is, a death to self, involving legalism, unbelief, and all unrighteousness; and a life in the soul, a life that will never die, begotten by the Holy Spirit, consisting in the love of God. Who can discover

a ground for a mode of baptism from the foregoing three figures? The Apostle had no reference to the burial of the natural body under water, just as he had no reference to the natural body when he used the figure of planting, and crucifixion. It is the carnal nature that is to be buried, planted, and crucified. Hence we are unable to get a figure from water baptism to represent planting, or crucifying, or even for burial. When the body is naturally dead, it is buried to remain buried until the resurrection. So also in the death of the carnal will, or mind. It shall not only be dead upon special occasions, but at all times. Sin shall not rule us, but we shall through the spirit crucify the flesh daily until death ends the conflict. The Apostle says, "Reckon ye yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin." That which is dead should be put away and buried; and *that is* the *burial* to which the Apostle has reference, and not the immersion of the natural body in water.

The text, Col. 2: 12, 13, will admit of the same explanation as that of Romans 6. "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through faith of the operation of God, who raised him from the dead." Any one reading with care that which goes before and that which follows after, will discover that the Apostle is writing of the change necessary to become an heir of the heavenly inheritance. He first writes of spiritual circumcision, that "made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ."

The same argument is continued, following the text above quoted. It is apparent that the Apostle has not under consideration the mode of baptism. Water baptism can only *represent* the change the Apostle is describing. A faithful servant of the Lord defines water baptism thus: "The application of water to the body in baptism denotes washing. We testify in our baptism, our solemn and public profession of having been internally washed and cleansed from our sins, by the blood of Jesus Christ applied to our hearts and conscience by the Holy Ghost; and, being washed and cleansed, we are also dead to sin, and have buried sin; and are now willing to live to the Lord." If more attention were given to the necessary qualifications for receiving baptism, and a fuller understanding attained of the obligation under which it places the recipient, there would probably be less controversy about the mode.

As there has been much strained and unwarranted effort made by some of our Baptist friends to establish and defend immersion, for which they show such undue veneration; and having manifested more energy and perseverence during late years in their way, we feel the more constrained to give our voice and pen in an effort to turn the thoughts to those things which water baptism sets forth, and try to help correct the misuse to which the ordinance has been subjected. Although baptism is a holy ordinance, yet we feel safe in asserting that it possesses no saving virtue, or in other words, that it is no

means of salvation. Aside from its initiatory office, baptism is only a figurative ordinance, though of great significance, as are the other ordinances. All accept that in the eucharist, the bit of bread and the sip of wine are not what make it so expressive, and that they are not the direct means of effecting that which it is designed to set forth. It is a symbolical, commemorative ordinance, and is only expressive when observed by those who are spiritually in possession of the principles and relations which are so aptly represented in the nature of the emblems. The Apostle Paul says, "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come," which fixes its commemorative import; and then adds the judgement that will pass upon an unworthy observance of it. Hence an unqualified person, or body of worshipers, do not, and can not, show forth the Lord's death by partaking of the emblems, but are said to be guilty of the body and blood of Christ. So also with water baptism; it is not how much water, or in what way applied, nor is it in any virtue of the water, but it all rests upon the qualification of the baptized as well as of the baptizer, whether it will set forth that which it is designed to represent, or whether it will not. We can all accept that there is no consistency in consecrating church furniture by the use of water in any way, and just as insignificant is the baptism of an unconverted person, or an innocent child. Neither one would possess the prerequisites, and baptism upon such conditions effects nothing more in

the person than it does in the inanimate objects; and when we would administer it upon such, we but trifle with and pervert the use of one of God's ordinances. As the Christian religion did not grow out of the church, but the church out of the Christian religion, so regeneration does not originate with baptism, but baptism is that which is designed to represent the new life; but as it can not represent a principle or condition before it exists in the baptized, so it can not properly be administered upon unconverted persons.

We can not accept the Baptist precept, that "without water baptism there is no remission of sin," and its counterpart, "without immersion there is no baptism." If this proposition be true, then all the unbaptized must be lost; but if we can satisfactorily show that one individual soul has ever been saved, or attained to a saved state, without it, then the proposition is unscriptural. We have personal knowledge of awakened, unbaptized souls, who, unassisted by man, attained to a degree of spiritual knowledge that evinced extensive experience, who could consistently be comforted by the promises of God's word, and whose attainments would do credit to any one. Now as we know that remission of sin must be obtained before there can be any spiritual progress, we must conclude that such did realize the mercy of God in the forgiveness of their sins. And we must repeat, that baptism can not consistently be administered upon any who have not had such experience.

Our Savior says, "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; and he that believeth not, shall be damned." We must accept that to believe, in the sense here implied, is to attain to the possession of the holy unction, by faith in the merits of Christ's atonement, through repentance and regeneration. This virtually is the baptism of the spirit, which we maintain is the one thing essential to salvation. Water baptism is primarily an initiatory ordinance, but is expressive of the inward change, and so a true representation of the spiritual baptism. Then for any to assert, that "without baptism there is no remission of sin," is to pervert the order of God, and to oppose the plain testimony and records of the New Testament. It is recorded that Cornelius and all who heard the word with him, received the Holy Spirit before Peter commanded them to be baptized; and, as has been said, remission of sin must precede the receiving of the Holy Spirit, so their sins must have been remitted before they were baptized. We have no proof of the thief on the cross having been baptized, yet our Savior comforted him with these words: "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Some who attach so much importance to water baptism, say that this occurred in the day of miracles, and our Savior being the testator, could exercise authority according to his wisdom and mercy, but now salvation must be attained by the means appointed in his Gospel, which are repentance, baptism and regeneration. We would ask these, could God be "just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus,"

if he then accepted even one soul upon fairer terms than he will accept us now? Or will the immutable law of God yield to accommodate sinful man? There was ever but one way of promise, and that was by faith and obedience. We believe that the thief through mercy attained to that faith, as his language testifies, and that he would have rendered that obedience if spared in life, and this is what commended him to his Savior.

A certain Baptist writer says, "I do not believe that the act of baptism cleanses us from sin; neither do I believe that faith and repentance do; but I believe that when we exercise the one faith in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost, and baptism rightly performed in these names there the blood of Christ will be applied, 'which cleanseth from all sin.' Yet it is attributed to baptism because *this is the act that secures the promise.*" Can this be supported by the scriptures? Truly do men "hew out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water." Is not the sum of all the promises based upon faith and repentance, which if honestly and sincerely experienced, will lead to self-denial and a renewing of the mind? What is the support of that faith? "Christ, and him crucified." By, or through any material, or tangible means or ordinances? The Apostle Paul answers in Titus 3:5: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Some go so far as to call baptism the "washing of regeneration,"

to attach the more importance to it. Such do not know the scriptures nor the power of God, and do greatly err. As regeneration can not be attained by works, so also can it not be by ordinances. Baptism is but the sign of regeneration and not the thing signified. To say that " Baptism is the act that secures the promise " is to ground our hope upon the shadow and not upon the substance. We can not reach such conclusions except we follow a legal mind.

Would it accord with the love and mercy of the Father to give us a plan of salvation that is beyond the reach of even one individual member of the human family? And if there were no remission of sin without baptism, how many poor souls must pass out of this time of grace without hope. It is only the awakened sinner that has the promise, but how many of these have not the opportunity of baptism. Will God reject the awakened, contrite sinner, who calls upon him from the depth of his penitent soul, because he may be deprived of the means of receiving water baptism? Such Christ promises to give rest.

There was an account published during our late civil war of a poor wounded soldier who lay on the battle-field through the night after the battle, and who the writer said prayed most earnestly to God for mercy and pardon of sin, and so loud that he could be heard by man as well as by the Lord. He confessed his sins and seemed to have received comfort. And why should he not? We do firmly believe, and we have the support of the scriptures, that God will hear and pardon every such soul, when-

ever and wherever he thus seeks him, and that without baptism or any other ordinance.

It is a practice too common to be unobserved, that many ministers of the gospel, and notably those who advocate that "without baptism there is no remission of sin," to quote the language of Peter on the day of Pentecost, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," and not use at all his remarks upon the next occasion, as recorded in the third chapter of Acts, "Repent ye therefore and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." This practice is well calculated to deceive those who do not search the word of truth, and who do not dig deep, but are content to accept the counsel of man. We believe that every such minister who allows his partiality for his own opinions, and prejudices to those of others to influence him to such an extent, is chargeable with not rightly dividing the word, and must give account in that great day. Every one sees the contrast in the wording of these two Scriptures. The first would seem to make baptism of equal importance with repentance, while the latter gives us strong proof that remission of sin does not depend upon baptism, as no mention is made of it. But we will ever encounter difficulties when we try to make figures and ordinances embody that which they can but represent.

Whenever we depart from a blending or harmony of the Scriptures, that a plainer text is brought to our help

to define one not so clear, and begin to show a preference for that part which plainly supports our opinions, or creed, and reject or neglect that which does not, we give the most conclusive evidence of not being born of the spirit, as we are not in harmony with it in the word. When we do these things we give unmistakable proof of a legal spirit, and that we are trying to use the Scriptures to effect our selfish ends. How important that we give up everything of our own, and accept Christ and his Gospel as our all in all.

In concluding the consideration of the mode of baptism, we will again invite attention to the silence of New Testament teaching relative to modes and forms. It is not stated whether the ordinances shall be received in the evening, at noon, or in the morning; neither is it stated at what season of the year; or whether at home, or in the public assembly; whether sitting, kneeling, or standing; whether little or much water should be used in baptism; neither in the Eucharist, whether leavened or unleavened bread. The outward forms are not specifically described. The *things represented* by the ordinances are of vital importance to us. We do not despise forms; we recognize order as indispensable, and that there can be no order without uniformity of practice; and, therefore, forms are necessary. But what we do object to is the idolizing of forms and modes, which is done when we become fixed upon a mode without scripture ground. We ask, where is it commanded, or where is the example on rec-

ord to instruct us that believers shall be baptized *in* the water, and *under* the water? The apostle Peter teaches, "Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example that we should follow his steps; who when he was reviled, reviled not again, when he suffered, he threatened not." We shall follow Christ in the regeneration; become partakers of the divine nature, and have restored unto our souls the love and image of God. There is no command that we shall go back under the law and be baptized in Jordan, and be made disciples of John, whose baptism, we repeat, was not Christian baptism, and so did not belong to the ordinances of Christ's church. If persons realized more fully what kind of life is required of the Christian, they would be more solicitious to know themselves, and to become acquainted with Gospel requirements, and less occupied with forms and modes, and not so much concerned about being baptized.

SEPARATION FROM,

Or Not Worshiping with Those Who Are Not Sound in Faith and Doctrine.

"If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine receive him not into your house, neither bid him God's speed; for he that biddeth him God's speed is partaker of his evil deeds." (2 John, 10, 11.) "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness; and what communion hath light with darkness." (2 Cor. 6 : 14.) "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." (2 Cor. 6 : 17, 18.) In the creation, God separated the light from the darkness; so that naturally light and darkness have no communion. The same is true in the spiritual creation and kingdom of God. Christ is the spiritual light of the world. All the spiritual light the world has had from the beginning came through this divine source. This true light was foretold by the prophets. "The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light; they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined." (Isaiah 9 : 2.) "For, behold, the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people; but the Lord shall arise upon thee and his glory shall be seen upon

thee. And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising." (Isaiah 60 : 2, 3.) The testimony of Christ himself is, "I am the light of the world ; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." It is apparent that all who believe in Christ are regenerated and brought into the true light, which is manifest by their obedience to his commands. This is affirmed by the Apostle John: "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son." (2 John, 9.) Again," If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth ; but if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." (1 John, 1 : 6, 7.)

Since light and darkness have no communion, it is manifest that those who walk in the light cannot consistently worship with those who walk in darkness. It is contrary to the divine order. All who possess the love of God obey his word. "If ye love me keep my commandments." Disobedience to the commands of Christ is darkness. In the preceding part of this tract, we have endeavored to produce scriptural authority for the doctrine of unity, and non-resistance, and for baptism upon a living, saving faith. If these doctrines there expressed are orthodox, then they who reject them are in opposition to light. If the doctrine of a united church, and that of

passive submission to suffering wrongfully, as also that of baptism upon saving faith, are scriptural, then those who oppose them are transgressors of the doctrine of Christ, and are in darkness; and how can a truly enlightened person join in worship with transgressors. The language of the Apostle is very impressive. "If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth." And again, "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them." "For whosoever biddeth him God's speed is partaker of his evil deeds." All spiritually enlightened persons have proven the will of God, and have found that it consists of obedience to his revealed word, the Gospel of Christ; and, therefore, they are constrained through love to refuse to worship with those who are not found in the obedience of the Gospel. Worshiping with those who disobey the doctrine of Christ evinces either a lack of true knowledge of the will of God, or wilful hypocrisy. Every regenerated person loves his neighbor with an unfailing love, desiring his spiritual and temporal happiness. Since love worketh no ill to his neighbor, he will apprise him of any danger to which he may see him exposed; for no error is so fatal as that of professing and believing that one is a child of God, and an heir of heaven, while yet groping in darkness. It is possible that one can feel confident of being admitted into the kingdom of everlasting glory, and yet be mistaken. "If the light that is in you be darkness, how great is that darkness."

Such was the state of the Pharisees. The true test of the soul's being possessed by the divine life, is its obedience through love, "If ye love me, keep my commandments."

The people of God were from the beginning separated from the world. Abraham was called out of has father's house; and in obedince to the divine call, he forsook his kindred, and obeyed the Lord. Israel was not at liberty to join in worship with any strange nation; and if a prophet arose among them who taught contrary to their law, they were not to hearken to his words. The separation was typified by Israel as a chosen people or nation. Under their law, the unequal yoking of different animals was forbidden; also the sowing of a field with mingled seed, and wearing garments mingled of wool and linen (Lev. 19 : 19); which typified separation from the world. These prohibitions imply that under the new and spiritual dispensation, believers cannot enjoy the pleasures of the world, and yet be followers of Christ. "Whatsoever parteth the hoof, and is cloven-footed, and cheweth the cud, among beasts, that shall ye eat." (Lev. 11 : 3.) Parting the hoof very aptly represents separation from the world, and from all manner of sin; chewing the cud typifies a serious reading of, and meditation upon the word of life, or Gospel of Christ, which is thus expressed, "Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity." "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly." The Israelites were not only forbidden to eat the flesh of

unclean animals, but they were not allowed to touch their dead bodies. These figurative precepts are far reaching, and abound with spiritual instruction. When there is a comparison made between the nature and disposition of the two classes of animals, it impresses the mind with what a Christian is to cherish, and what he is to avoid.

The foundation and ground of the *outward separation* is the *inward separation* of the *heart from all unrighteousness*, both open and concealed. The outward separation from the idle pastimes of the world, and from false worship, without the inward separation, to the extent of taking every thought captive to the obedience of Christ, would be hypocrisy, and be displeasing to the Lord. All Christians are born again, and are partakers of the divine nature, and love what God loves, and hate what he hates. Therefore, they separate from the corruptions, contentions, pride and follies of this world. If they should through weakness be betrayed into an unchristian act, they confess it, condemn it, and repent of it. How can they countenance that in others which they condemn in themselves. How can they join in the worship of those who engage in litigation, and often live in contention and strife? How can they bid God's speed to those who are upon erring ways? It has frequently been remarked that the right way to purify the profession of religion is to mingle with the churches, take part in their services, set them a good example, and teach them the

good and right way. Such reasoning is plausible, but it is not scriptural. The language of scripture is, "Come out from among them"; "Mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them." If any one of the members of the many so-called churches should awaken to a true knowledge of the requirements of the Gospel, and should insist upon obedience to the commandments of Christ and of his Apostles, he would discover that he could accomplish no change in such a religious body, since they have not the principle and foundation of the saving doctrine of Christ; and so he would be necessitated to come out from among them, and they would also gladly part from his company as a church-member. Such a person would be of as little use to them as the ark of the covenant was to the Philistines. It became an affliction to them, and they were anxious to be relieved of its presence. "Can two walk together except they be agreed." (Amos 3 : 3.) In worldly trades and professions there are certain principles involved which those must acquire who wish to engage in them with a prospect of success; for having the principles, they readily comprehend the system. But in order to labor in harmony, they must agree, which they always will when they work by the same rule. In the medical profession there are different systems of practice based upon different principles. Those of the same school or system, can work in harmony, but those of opposite systems cannot. Although laboring for the same end, they

cannot consistently consult together; neither can they jointly administer medicines. Can two walk together except they be agreed?

Two persons professing to be Christians, holding such opposite views as the following must be possessed of different principles. The popular view is that the division of professed Christians into many denominations is admissible, as is also the waging of just wars, the prosecution at law in behalf of justice. the swearing of legal oaths, infant church-membership, and conformity to the world in living in the pride of life. The other view is, a Christian cannot consistently serve as a soldier, he cannot sue at law in defense of his reputation and property, he cannot swear a legal oath, and cannot conform to this vain world in its customs and pastimes, nor are infants proper subjects for church membership. Two persons entertaining such opposite views can not both be right, and therefore cannot consistently worship together. If the one holding the latter sentiments is correct, he should be constrained through love to refuse to join in worship with the other holding to the former ground, for his conviction and awakening, in the hope of his better enlightenment. "Wherefore my dearly beloved flee from idolatry." (1 Cor. 10:14.) All professed Christians admit that joining in idol-worship is wrong and displeasing to the Lord; but they assert there is no idol-worship now among professed Christians, since they all recognize the only true God, Creator of heaven and earth, and Jesus Christ

the Son of God, as the Savior of sinners. Nevertheless, all unregenerate persons are spiritual idolators, since they serve the creature and love the world; and the love of the Father is not in them. The fact of a person directing his prayer to Christ does not constitute him a Christian. To be a Christian one must have the spirit of Christ. The heathen directing his petition to an idol, and the nominal Christian his petition to God, (being yet in his sins) are of the same religion, since they fulfil the same unmortified, fleshly desires. Worship directed to different objects, while the worshipers have unregenerated hearts, leaves them in the same relation to the one true and living God. The object of adoration not being the same does not in any way affect their spiritual state. Two persons, both living after the flesh, the one a professed worshiper of God, the other a devotee of Buddha, are, nevertheless, both enemies to the truth and to God, since they are led by the same spirit, and are fulfilling the desires of their fallen nature. Those who reject the grace of God and continue to live in opposition to the life and doctrine of Christ, are as much his enemies as those were who crucified him. These crucified him outwardly, or personally; and those crucify him inwardly or in spirit, by rejecting his grace and holy truth. Judas kissed Christ and said, "Hail, Master," and thus betrayed him; and those who profess to love him, and shut him out of their hearts by not suffering his spirit to rule them, because they love the friendship of the world, and the praise of

man, and the pleasures of sin, more than the virtues of Christ, are guilty of crucifying him afresh. It is evident that the open idolator, and the professed, unregenerate Christian are of the same religion; and are, therefore, both idolators, serving the prince of darkness. Christians will separate from the worship of such.

It did not avail when the Jews set up the claim of being Abraham's children, because they did not the works of Abraham; neither did it avail that they professed that God was their Father, while their hearts were filled with malice and wickedness. Jesus answered them, "If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham"; and, "If God were your Father ye would love me, for I proceeded forth and came from God." They were Abraham's lineal descendants, and were professed worshipers of the God of Israel; but their hearts were not right, and, therefore, their worship and service was idolatry. Jesus charged them with being in the service of the devil; "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." It is evident that any one void of the love of God, who yet professes to be a believer in Jesus Christ, is not an acceptable worshiper. To worship acceptably, the person or persons worshiping must be possessed of the spirit of Christ; then they can worship in spirit and in truth. The Prophet Isaiah refers to the solemn assembly of the Jews, how they offered sacrifices and burnt offerings, and spread out their hands toward the Lord, and raised their voices in solemn

prayer; yet the Lord declared he would not smell into their solemn assemblies; and when they spread forth their hands, he will hide his face from them; and when they make many prayers, he will not hear. (Isaiah 1:11–15.) Why did the Lord reject their service? It was not because they were not zealous in worship. Why then could he not accept it? Because they were disobedient. So it is at the present time. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven."

From the foregoing testimonies, it is evident that all worship is not acceptable to God; and that it is not only not acceptable to him, but that much of it is an abomination to him. This being the case, it is evident that God's children cannot consistently join in any worship, or religious service, that is not in agreement with scripture testimony. "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity." (Matt. 7:22, 23.) In this text the allusion is not to idol-worshipers, but to professed, zealous worshipers of the true God. Can the children of God countenance what he reproves? Surely not. Therefore, they are impelled by true charity to withdraw from all worship that disagrees with Gospel requirements. Israel had this test for

the prophets; If there arose among them a prophet who gave them a sign or wonder; and the sign or wonder came to pass, but the prophet taught the worship of other gods; then they were not to hearken to his words. Under the law those who taught the people obedience to the law, and directed them into truth and righteousness, were true prophets. Those who flattered the princes and the priests in their disobedience, and promised peace contrary to the law of God, were false prophets, and were avoided by all the faithful of Israel. Elijah and the seven thousand unknown to him, who had not kissed Baal, neither bowed their knee to him, stood aloof from the popular homage paid him.

Christ's instructions were, "Beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits." The sheep's clothing is the profession of faith in Christ, and of obedience to his word. It conveys the idea of outward sanctity, and of harmlessness. A preacher may appear blameless in his walk and conversation, and manifest a zeal for the conversion of souls by directing the people to Jesus Christ, the Savior of sinners, and teaching them to place their whole confidence in his blood and righteousness, and yet be a false prophet. If he does not lead the people by teaching and by example in faithful *obedience* to *all* the commandments of the Lord Jesus, he surely comforts them in their sins. There are many intelligent, honorable, and most worthy men, who fill the

office of the ministry, who teach that it does not matter to what church or denomination a person belongs, if only he is sincere, then he is a good Christian. Such teaching is contrary to sound doctrine, and encourages divisions. The Apostle writes, "Mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine ye have learned and avoid them." We have previously endeavored to demonstrate the unity of the church. It is either correct, or incorrect, that all the redeemed of the Lord are united in faith, doctrine and practice, and constitute one united church. If it can be demonstrated by the Scriptures that Christ came to destroy the works of the devil, to recreate man after the image of him who did create him in the beginning, to give him power to become a son of God, and to unite all the children of God together, one and inseparable, then those who oppose the doctrine of unity are not faithful witnesses of Christ. This position is very offensive to many worthy and learned persons. To them it evinces a lack of intelligence, and of charity; and they take it as an evidence of narrow-mindedness, if not of self-righteousness. But notwithstanding these views of our friends, the word of the Lord stands firm, and will be our judge at the last and coming day. If the church of Christ may consist of two separate and distinct organizations, not united in faith, doctrine and worship, then it may consist of a thousand separate organizations. Some of our friends even claim that divisions are advantageous; that they stimulate effort for the conversion of sinners, and

serve as an accommodation to differences of opinion entertained by different persons. This is reason but not Gospel. Those who maintain such views are not spiritually enlightened; and those who teach them are false prophets and are to be avoided. No one is a true prophet who does not teach and enforce obedience to all the commandments of Christ and his Apostles. Christians are chosen out of the world; they do not conform to the vain fashions of the world, nor indulge in foolish talking and in idle pastimes, which tend only to the gratification of the carnal nature; nor take part in the temporal government in any practice of coercion or violence; nor resist evil; but suffer passively for well doing; thus following the footsteps of their Master.

There is much time wasted in attending places of amusement, and in the preparation of gay attire for the perishable body. These things are the invention of the carnal mind, and persons who have experienced the power of redemption by being spiritually baptized into Christ's death, and have thereby been raised to newness of life, will not waste their time in vain conversation, nor adorn their perishable bodies to gratify the pride of life, in attempting to draw admiration to themselves. Among the great mass of professors of religion at the present time, there is no question as to liberty in dress, furnishing of houses, and indulging in light-minded conversation, called pleasantry. The members of most churches have unlimited privileges in these things. Ministers give en-

couragement to their flock by their example. They dress according to the ever changing fashions; live in finely furnished houses; engage freely in mirthful conversation; and attend humorous lectures where the audience is frequently convulsed with laughter. In the consideration of the worldly life of the popular churches, we are led to the important inquiry: Where is the humility, meekness, peace and non-worldliness of primitive Christianity? Where is the dividing line between the church and the world? The popular church of to-day bears the spirit and life of the world. "They that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh." (Rom. 8:5.) If the foregoing representation of the popular churches is correct, then their worship is not acceptable to God; and, in consequence, his children will separate from it. "And when he putteth forth his own sheep, he goeth before them, and the sheep follow him, for they know his voice. And a stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him; for they know not the voice of strangers." (John 10:4. 5.) "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." (John 20:21.) All faithful ministers are shepherds watching over the flock. They have the spirit of their Master; they teach what he taught, and love what he loves. He was the great Shepherd who gave his life for the sheep. The ministers sent by him serve the church out of love, and not for money, nor for any worldly consideration. Such faithful pastors, the sheep hear and obey, for they know their voice; but the voice of a

stranger they know not; they flee from him. The pastor who sanctions divisions, self defense, litigation, conformity to the world, the retention of known sinners in the church, is a stranger that enlightened believers will not hear. The principle of the separation being love, it influences all who possess it to stand by the word of God, and to uphold and defend it by all means consonant with love, even to the extent of separating from all forms of worship, not in harmony with the doctrine of Christ. They are constrained through love to prayerfully and conscientiously lay off this testimony for the awakening and salvation of those who are in error. Christ said to his disciples, "And it shall turn to you for a testimony." (Luke 21 : 13.) This is the object of Christians separating from all worship not bearing fruits consistent with living, saving faith.

Whenever any one unites in worship with another, he gives evidence of approval, and bids him God's speed. Such action savors of unfaithfulness and darkness when there is no unity. Quite recently we heard it advocated, that if a member of either of the so-called orthodox churches does what is right, is morally honest, kind, charitable, and a devoted worshiper, he is certainly a Christian, even if some of his brethren do not live Christian lives; and that he may partake communion with them without doing wrong. Such teaching sounds well, but it is contrary to many plain commands of the New Testament, among which are those found in Matt. 18:15-19, 1

Cor. 5:4-13, 2 Thess. 3:11-15, and 3:6. Those who teach such doctrine are corrupters of the pure doctrine of Christ, and, consequently, are deceivers and false prophets; and Christians will not hear them. Attendance at, and giving audience to any public meeting, is an expression of approval. If a person attends a place of public amusement, his presence is evidence of his approval of the object of the meeting. When a professed Christian attends a public meeting where religious services are performed, his presence is evidence that he recognizes the service as beneficial to souls, and promotive of God's honor, and thereby bids it God's speed. How can any one who is enlightened take such liberty unless he recognizes the worshipers as sound in faith and doctrine?

Not hearing unfaithful preachers is of scriptural authority. It is a deed of love designed to beget reflection, and effect amendment of life in those from whom we separate. Jesus Christ is the spiritual Bridegroom, and the church is the bride. She must be perfect in love and obedience. If she falls in love with the world, and her affections become divided, he will reject her. "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon." "Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God?" (James 4:4.) Those were not natural adulterers. The church of Christ must, therefore, be loyal to the Bridegroom. She will not trifle with the spirit of worldly religion, and contaminate herself. She cannot hear the voice of strangers, for the chaste bride is true to her hus-

band, and spurns the flattery and caresses of strangers. During the sixteenth century, there were hundreds and thousands martyred, whose lives were most exemplary, (as acknowledged by their enemies) who refused to hear the preachers whom they did not recognize as ministers of Christ.

It may occur to some of our friends that there are many churches professing non-resistance, who do not conform to the world in its pride and lightmindedness, and who observe strict moral discipline. You may ask, why separate from such? For the following reasons: First, they do not recognize unity, or that there can be but one church of Christ united in faith and practice, the same wherever it exists. Secondly, they do not hold sound views upon the doctrine of non-resistance, for they tolerate litigation and self-defence before the courts in some cases; and some vote and hold offices under the civil government, which no non-resistant can consistently do; and they also become members of chartered corporations, thus making themselves liable for the actions of such bodies. Thirdly, they unite in preaching and worshiping with those to whom they refuse communion. Some of the ministers justify themselves in this liberty, because they do not regard them, nor call them brethren. That is, they preach with them, notably at funerals, and join with them in prayer, but do not publicly acknowledge them as brethren. This they refuse to do because the popular preachers justify infant baptism, swearing of oaths, and self-de-

fense. But why not call them brethren? Are they not ministers of Christ directing a dying world to the way of life? If not, why do they stand side by side with them in the capacity of ministers of Christ? Why do they worship together in the attitude of prayer? Such liberty surely gives encouragement to the hearers to believe that such preachers are called of God to minister in his word. But if they recognize those with whom they preach, and with whom they join in worship, as ministers of Christ, they do a great wrong by refusing publicly to recognize them as brethren.

Some of the ministers of the plain denominations give as a reason for preaching with those with whom they are not united in doctrine, that they are solicited by friends to do so, or, in other words, are called; and that it is the duty of a minister to obey when called. It should, however, be borne in mind that it is the duty of a minister of Christ to declare the whole counsel of God; and it undoubtedly is his duty to go when he is called, but upon conditions that no restraint is imposed upon him, and that he be left free to obey his conviction of duty. If these were sincere in their profession, they would be necessitated, when called to preach with those who maintain undue liberties, to testify openly that they do not recognize them as ministers of Christ, and give the ground for such a protest. In this manner only could they be consistent in occupying the position they now do; but every one readily recognizes that such a course would be very of-

fensive, and would cause disorder ; nor would such liberty be accorded them by those who call them to serve with those preachers ; neither would it be edifying. Therefore, the only plain way open is to refuse such requests as that of preaching and uniting in prayer with those with whom we are not united. Some of these maintain that when called to preach with others with whom they are not united, they go out free ; by which they mean, they speak the truth and spare not. We know, however, that they do not go out free, according to their profession ; for, if they did, they would not be called to serve with those men, whom they now condemn by their profession, and yet by their preaching and praying with them, comfort them, and mislead their hearers. Again, those plain denominations attend each others public service, but refuse each other participation in the church ordinances. They do not commune together.

There are those who baptize by trine immersion, who occasionally attend the public service of other plain denominations ; but if one of those whom they go to hear preach, would desire to unite with their church, they would re-baptize him. Why would they do so? Are those ministers, whom they go to hear, not called to preach ? If they are called to preach, they are also authorized to administer baptism. From whence then have these men the scripture authority to re-baptize any one who had been baptized by a minister of Christ ? If they do not regard these men as ministers of Christ why do

they hear them preach, contrary to Christ's teaching? We would ask the ministers of any of those plain denominations, which of the many denominations is the church of Christ? If a troubled soul comes to you for counsel to find the way of life, and the church of Christ, to which of the many churches do you direct him? If you answer, to the church of which you are a minister, then you believe that you are a member and a minister of the church of Christ. If so, how can you take the liberty to hear those ministers who are not members of the church of Christ? There is no middle ground. The church of Christ is not a *sect*, but it is the *body* of *Christ*, animated by his spirit, and united in love. There is one of two positions that our plain friends are necessitated to occupy; either that there is one, united, visible church, of which Christ is the head; or, that the church of Christ consists of the good in all the different denominations. Mark, if they accept the last proposition, then the *test* of a Christian is his good intentions, and his moral life. If they accept the first proposition, they are inconsistent in worshiping with those of the other denominations. If they accept the last, they are inconsistent in holding close communion. For these, and other inconsistencies, we refuse to hear the preachers of the plain denominations. We are not insensible to the fact that in all the denominations, both plain and fashionable, there are many morally honest persons of amiable disposition, diligent in good works; such as clothing the naked, feeding the hungry, and receiving the stranger

into their houses; and, in a general way, laboring with their worldly means and their talent for the amelioration of their fellow creatures. We highly appreciate their moral worth and general kindness of disposition; but neither of the above named virtues, nor all of them together, would constitute a Christian. To be a Christian, is to love Christ, and obey him; which if those kind friends would do, they would come out of those so-called churches, where Christ's commands are not obeyed, and separate from them.

It is claimed that not hearing the preachers is at variance with Paul's teaching, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." (1 Thess. 5:21.) The conclusion is drawn from this text that it is not only a privilege, but a duty, to hear the preachers who come professedly in the name of Christ. The Apostle's epistle was written to the church of Christ, and his counsel was to the members of the church that they should prove all things by the infallible standard, the *revealed will of God.* Their liberty and duty in the matter of proving was limited to the church; which was then one body, of one faith, for sectarianism was then unknown. They were not to go outside the church to prove the sentiments advanced by the world. The Apostle to the Corinthians writes, "For what have I to do to judge those that are without?" The sentiment of the Apostle is, that in the church there is liberty, and all the members are on an equality. They have the liberty to reveal their exercises, to make known their

revelations; and, notably, those in the ministry. But all members enjoy the privilege of proving all that is taught, either by the ministers, or by private members, and holding fast to that which is good; that is such doctrine, or interpretation, as accords with the teachings of the New Testament, and with their experience. Thus they would be edified in their association with one another. The teaching of Paul does not direct away from the true church, to those churches whom the truly enlightened have already proven and found wanting.

It is also asserted that the separation is in violation of our Lord's instruction as recorded in Matt. 7: 1-5, "Judge not, that ye be not judged." It is worthy of notice how frequently allusion is made to this text. We have heard friends speak of the very disorderly conduct of some professors of religion, and comment freely upon it; but presently they reminded themselves that it is written, "Judge not, that ye be not judged." From our youth we have frequently heard it remarked, that it is wrong to judge. It will be observed that Christ taught, "beware of false prophets; ye shall know them by their fruits." In this text it is enjoined upon us to know false prophets. To know is to have a fixed opinion, which is attained by the judgment of the mind. An enlightened mind adopts the revealed will of God as the basis for its conclusions. In the first named text, it is forbidden to judge; "Judge not." One of Christ's names is, *Counselor*. All his counsels are consistent and in perfect agreement. There

must then be a consistent way to reconcile those texts that at first sight appear to conflict. When he said, "Judge not," he meant that his disciples and followers should not suspect each other's motive. The Apostle teaches, "Wherefore dost thou judge thy brother, or set at naught thy brother." The Apostle had reference to liberties taken that were not in themselves sinful, but offensive to fellow believers. In such cases one should not judge another, so as to suspect his motives, since charity thinketh no evil." One believer shall not judge another in things in themselves not sinful, even when the failing is through want of watchfulness, or through lack of discretion. He shall not be judged and condemned as wicked at heart; for in the case of sinning through weakness, which is afterward repented of and acknowledged, such failing shall be forgiven, the confession accepted, and the motive as to sincerity not judged. As we can not see into the heart, it is wrong to judge the motive of any one, where there are no manifest fruits of wickedness. But some might ask, *is it ever right to judge*? We answer thus: If a man steals, he is a thief, and not an honest, law-abiding citizen. Those who pronounce him a thief, speak truthfully; yet they judge him, but only according to his fruits. The man who habitually gets drunk, is a drunkard. He is known to be such by his fruits; yet he is judged, but not by the judgment that Christ forbids. A citizen who transgresses any one of the laws of his country, is not a loyal subject. If any one

transgresses the doctrine of Christ, while professing to be a Christian, he manifests his principles by his fruits. He is judged by the word of the Lord, which declares, "He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar and the truth is not in him"; and again, "by their fruits ye shall know them." If a professed Christian sues at the law in defence of his reputation or property, he transgresses the doctrine of Christ, and is already judged; and if the true followers of Christ testify that he is not a Christian, they simply proclaim what his fruits witness. Therefore, the separation is not in opposition to the command, "Judge not." That command has reference to judging the motives; and does not forbid judgment based on the manifest acts of persons.

We will notice one more text that is adduced as evidence against the separation. "The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do, but do not ye after their works." (Matt. 23 : 2, 3.) It was the calling and office of the scribes and Pharisees to read the law on the Sabbath. The scribes were also expositors of the law. It is evident, however, that those to whom Christ directed the Jews, did not pervert the law; or he could not have said, "they sit in Moses' seat." The reason why Christ directed his disciples and the people to the scribes and Pharisees, was because the law was still in force, for it was not yet fulfilled; and its typical sacrifices were not yet abolished; the veil of the temple was not yet rent, and

the abiding reality had not yet come. But after Christ was offered once for all, and the demands of divine justice were satisfied, the victory won, and eternal life secured, the true tabernacle reared, and the spiritual worship restored, he did not direct his people to the scribes and Pharisees, but to those who were regenerated, and who were true worshipers of God. Under the Old Testament dispensation, the Jews were directed to the teachers appointed under Moses, who taught obedience to the law and its ceremonies. The ceremonies and ordinances of the law were figurative and shadowy, and have ceased under the New Testament dispensation, in which there is the appointment of a ministry, who, as true shepherds, lead the flock upon the green pastures of the Gospel. They dispense the bread of life to hungry souls; they preach the everlasting Gospel of Christ—the unadulterated word of God—not for earthly reward, but from love. To such pastors and teachers, who are ambassadors in his stead, Christ directs the people; and especially those who are willing to obey the truth and become his disciples. The new, spiritual dispensation has come. Its subjects are regenerated souls, living stones, spiritual worshipers. Such souls hunger and thirst after the bread and water of life. They desire teachers who are full of the Holy Ghost: and who can direct them to the fountain of living water. True pastors and teachers are examples to the flock; they are vigilant, sober, of good behavior, patient, not covetous, apt to teach, and sound in doctrine. Such pas-

tors and teachers Christ and his Apostles ordained, and such the members will hear and obey; but they will refuse to join in worship with those who are not in harmony with the eternal, unchanging word of God; and also refuse to hear all preachers who do not lead their flocks into the obedience of the Gospel.

To the great majority of professed Christians, the Separation, or not worshiping with those not sound in faith and doctrine, is a strange and incomprehensible thing, and those who practice it are looked upon with disfavor. We are constrained to tell such of our friends, for whom we have the highest regard, that it ought not be necessary for us to state that the Christian dare not be influenced by selfish motives, for if he would consent to "confer with flesh and blood," he would in this, as in all things pertaining to the divine life, soon lose the aid and comfort of the Divine Presence. We all should know that carnal reason is the great enemy and destroyer of the true Christian faith. We should also know that what seems right and proper to the natural, unconverted person, generally proves to be at variance with the spirit and teaching of the Gospel. Paul says, "the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh," and our Savior to Nicodemus, "Ye must be born again." It is the new man, the man renewed in his mind by the enlightening influence of the Holy Spirit, and thus freed from the carnal will, and dead to the world and worldly honors, that must test the consistency or inconsistency of

the doctrine of the Separation. If what we have presented upon this subject is in accord with Scripture teaching, then we have no choice, but must accept it as a part of our duty, no matter how much the flesh may suffer, or how great a cross it may be to us. And we frankly admit that such it is to the flesh to lay off this testimony to all, that we can not accept as orthodox, nor can we in any way encourage the prevailing views and practices of the many organizations professing to be worshipers of the true God, but we have witness within ourselves that the only consistent and truly charitable course for us to pursue, is to separate from the same.

We love the souls of all men, and we insist as a duty that we direct to those things which tend to elevate and advance the soul's welfare, and that lead to the obedience of the Gospel. True love will not allow us to shirk any duty that we really owe to our fellow man, and surely one of our obligations is to point out whatever of error we see that has served as a base for a false hope. We know full well that just here we are charged with selfishness, and even with a want of courtesy; but we trust that we know our hearts, and every one ought to accord us so much charity as to accept our word when we say that it affords no kind of earthly pleasure to be necessitated to do this service, and surely it does not bring us any honor or esteem from any one. But every faithful servant becomes inured to that inward strife, in which the whole armor of God must be brought into service to quell the

uprisings of the carnal will, that the commandments of the Lord may prevail.

The prophets of old were commanded to cry aloud and spare not; and if they failed to declare the whole counsel of the Lord, then the blood of the people was required at their hands. When the Lord spake, it was not their office to question his word, but to obey it. So it has ever been that what the Lord speaks, or commands, is right, and what he forbids is wrong; and it is not for man to insinuate his views or preferences. So when the Lord commands, we must obey; and when he forbids we must refrain. When Adam and Eve were forbidden to eat of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, it was not their office to question the propriety, or impropriety of such a prohibition, nor its benefits, but to obey. So of Noah when instructed concerning the building of the ark, and the saving of a remnant of the human family, and of the land animals; his natural reason, if called into use, would have filled his mind with objections; but his only duty was to believe and obey. When we turn to the Lord calling Abraham out of his country from his kindred, and then promising him an innumerable posterity, for which he had to wait beyond our natural reason, and then commanding him to offer up as a burnt offering that only child of the promise, we have another example where faith and obedience remained alone as man's portion. Although the Lord promised Abraham that he would give the land of Canaan to him and his

posterity, yet they must sojourn in a strange land over four centuries. Then when about to be delivered they were commanded to institute the Jewish Passover to save themselves from the destroying angel, and when on the banks of the Red Sea, and Pharoah and his host within sight, they were commanded to "*stand still* and see the salvation of the Lord." They might have questioned the wisdom of either one, or even all these providences, but the only part that they could do to please the Lord was to believe and obey. When the tabernacle was reared, and the ceremonial law instituted, and sacrifices beyond number were required to be offered, often no doubt taxing heavily the means of those who offered them, and a large assembly of priests and Levites had to be supported by the industries of the rest, and when they were commanded to exclude all uncircumcised men from that service, and themselves to separate from all heathen worship, it was not their privilege to question the wisdom nor the propriety of any part of it, but simply to obey. When the man of God, by the word of the Lord, went out of Judah to Jeroboam at Bethel, to cry against the altar, or idolatrous worship at that place, he was charged to "eat no bread, nor drink no water, nor turn again by the same way that thou camest"; but, being prevailed upon by a pretended prophet, violated his commission, and so perished. Here again we have the strongest proof that any one in the service of the Lord can make no compromises, nor in any way cavil at his commands, but yield obed-

ience, doubting nothing. Evidences without number could be produced from the Bible to prove that we can give no place to carnal reason, or to human wisdom, or popular opinion, but that we must lay aside our logic and our natural preferences, and accept unconditionally the word of the Lord as the man of our counsel.

Then we might ask, why should it be considered so very uncharitable, and such an uncalled for thing for those who try in their great weakness to walk in the fear and counsel of the Lord, to refuse to worship with those who neglect or reject much of the plainest and most weighty part of his word, and who do not esteem the service of the Lord as paramount to every earthly consideration. If we all can accept that it was wise and proper for the Lord to forbid his people to worship with their neighbors, or to admit them uncircumcised into their temple, why can we not see as well that all unfaithful worship must be protested against and avoided as being equally wrong and hurtful. The Lord knows what is for our good, and how to provide, and we well know that the Apostle says truly, "Evil communications corrupt good manners"; and again, "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump;" for we have all witnessed that the Christian needs every help and encouragement, and must avoid every thing that would tend to an undue influence. If the Apostle Paul saw proper to counsel us to "Abstain from all *appearance* of evil," surely we should abstain from that which we *know* to be evil. The Lord speaks of himself

as a "jealous God," jealous of his people, and jealous of their worship. He can not be honored by any service not strictly in accord with his word; nor will he countenance it; nor will he acknowledge those who do countenance it.

We are aware that the least part of those professing the religion of Jesus Christ accept our views as expressed in the preceding pages, that the disciples of Christ were unconverted before Pentecost, and that the Holy Spirit was not an abiding, recreating principle with believers before that time. To more fully express our convictions, we concluded it proper to add somewhat to that which has been presented, under the different subjects, in the form of a

Supplement.

The disciples of Christ were as far from being qualified to preach the kingdom that they gave every evidence that they themselves did not understand it; and when, after his resurrection, Christ commissioned them to preach and baptize, he charged them to tarry in Jerusalem until they were indued with power. This would signify that they were not in possession of that power before. Any one noting the import of their inquiries, and the tenor of their conversations, with their selfish ambition before Pentecost, and contrasting it with their teaching and deportment on that day and afterward, is struck with the marvelous change—all evidence of a work of regeneration. We need go no further for proof upon this point

than the language of our Savior to his disciples in Matt. 18, 3, "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." If they were already converted men, his language was altogether impertinent. It was addressed directly and personally to them, and makes their entrance into the kingdom at some *future* time depend upon a turning, or a change in the whole inner life. If they were already in the kingdom, he would not have said, "*ye shall not enter.*" But all this is further confirmed by his language to Peter, "When thou art converted strengthen thy brethren." The new translation renders it, "When once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren." This would carry the mind to Peter's denial of Christ, his deep contrition, and his expected subsequent awakening to a consciousness of himself. But when we reflect upon his smiting with the sword, and our Savior's rebuke, and his vehement and profane denial of his Lord, we must conclude that he did not realize within himself, nor was he able at that time to comprehend the true character of Christ's mission. Weigh his life before Pentecost against his preaching and life on that day and after, and we must conclude that there was a *great turning, a true conversion* of Peter after his Master's departure.

The disciples had the advantage of hearing all our Savior's teaching, and of witnessing all his miracles, and of even enjoying within themselves that power for a time; but all this did not, nor could not bring them into the

power of the kingdom. It was with them then as with us now, the natural man cannot comprehend the things of the spirit. This is all made quite plain by what our Savior told them. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the comforter will not come unto you." "But when the comforter is come, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." A certain measure of the Holy Spirit had been vouchsafed from the beginning, and had been enjoyed to a greater or less extent by all, and the disciples enjoyed a portion sufficient for the time being, yet we must all accept that the abundant effusion of it spoken of by the prophet Joel 2:28, was not granted until after the ascension of Christ; for it was to follow as a fruit of the atonement, and to supply the place of the personal presence of Christ to his disciples. It required this full measure to effect the new birth, or full regeneration, that is ever to be a standing testimony of the power and efficiency of the vicarious sacrifice of the Son of God. Then, and not until then, was the kingdom of heaven, or the kingdom of God fully established upon the earth. Then, and not until then, were there converted, regenerated, spiritual children of God upon earth, who constituted that kingdom.

There seems to be considerable perplexity with many persons pertaining to the subject of the Holy Spirit. They think there is a contradiction in certain scripture declar-

ations. David said, "Take not thy Holy Spirit from me;" and the Apostle Peter uses this language; "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you, searching what, or what manner of time, the spirit of Christ *which was in them* did signify when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ." From these and other scripture testimonies it would appear that the Holy Spirit dwelt with the Lord's faithful servants, and even was in them, before the coming of Christ. On the other hand, we have the sure testimony given by the evangelist John, that the Holy Ghost was not given before the glorification of Jesus Christ. "For the Holy Ghost *was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified.*" The Apostle Paul to the Galatians says, "God sent forth his Son to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons, and because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." One thing is unmistakable, and that is that all mankind, in order to salvation, had need of the services of Christ, which was to save them from their sins by purging their hearts from the guilty stains of sin, by his atoning blood. This service was essential to adoption and heirship. It was also necessary in order to prepare the heart for the possession of the Holy Spirit, and for a temple of God. Before the coming of Christ and the accomplishment of redemption, there were no spiritual children among all the race of mankind. We have reference

to the *true sense* of spiritual children; such as *received the life of Christ.* Hence the Holy Spirit could not have been possessed as an *abiding* influence by those who lived before the outpouring of the same on the day of Pentecost.

In order to fully comprehend those testimonies which imply that those under the law possessed the Holy Spirit, we must consider their condition and relation to God at that time. They were still under the hardness of heart, which was not taken away; the new and living way was not yet opened; and those who prophesied of the coming of Christ and of his kingdom were, for the time being, filled with such a measure of the Holy Spirit as enabled them to speak the things which the Lord desired to make known; but they often comprehended comparatively little of what they spoke, but simply spoke as they were moved. It was evidently the same Holy Spirit which inspired the prophets of old that fell upon the believers under the Gospel and remained upon them. But it must be apparent that those under the law did not possess it in the same sense and degree as those do under the Gospel dispensation. Neither could they have, since they were not washed from their sins in the blood of Christ; and as it is the office of the Holy Spirit to sanctify and recreate, this could not be wrought until their sins were pardoned and removed.

Many persons maintain that there is no promise of the Holy Spirit until after baptism. Such fail to distinguish between the convicting, enlightening, regenerating and

sanctifying effects of the Holy Spirit, and his miraculous powers and effects. So soon as the sinner obeys his convictions, he is under the influence of the Holy Spirit, yet not as a comforter, but as a purifier, and as an enlightening agency; and when he accepts Christ by faith, he is justified, because he is pardoned. Now the Holy Spirit possesses the heart and sanctifies it. This change is not dependent upon baptism, or any other ordinance. When the language found in Acts 2:38 is compared with many other scriptures, it will be found that it is not intended to convey the idea that pardon and regeneration are obtained through baptism. Such circumstances as that recorded in Acts 8:17, have reference to the miraculous gifts and operations of the Holy Spirit; and those Samaritans whom Philip had baptized, had very probably partaken of the regenerating and sanctifying influences of the Spirit before the laying on of hands and the receiving of the miraculous gifts. The miraculous manifestations and effects were limited to the Apostolic age. The nature of the Holy Spirit is the same at all times, but its manifestations vary as to degree in different persons and under different circumstances.

CONCLUSION.

To our dear friends into whose hands this tract may fall, we kindly ask a careful reading of it. We have a mutual interest in each others eternal welfare; having been created for the same great end, that of glorifying our Creator, and enjoying his presence forever. In this small work is presented the doctrine of a united, Christian church, founded A. D. 33, at Jerusalem, upon the day of Pentecost, which has been continued to the present time, with the same life, doctrine, and ordinances. We believe it is the will of God, that his church should be found by all sincere seekers after truth; and to that end he has left us certain marks, or signs, by which the church can be identified. In this tract will be found the following marks of identity: Unity, non-resistance of evil, adult baptism upon faith, and separation from the world and from all forms of worship not in agreement with sound doctrine. The sentiments advanced in this tract may not accord with your views; they may appear to you uncharitable and circumscribed, and may evince a lack of knowledge, and of comprehensiveness of mind. We freely admit that according to our natural mind and feelings, we would arrive at a similar conclusion. This conclusion would be reached largely through *natural reason*, which would lead to a recognition of the thousands of eminent expounders of the Scriptures, who have devoted

their learning, their talents, and their time to their work; and whose interpretations have generally been accepted as orthodox. For an uneducated person to antagonize the views of such renowned theologians, to some persons might seem out of place. Notwithstanding, we have a duty to perform, which we desire to do through love for the salvation of souls. We are deeply impressed with the dangers attending persons in seeking to save their souls; and we are fearful that many will build upon an insecure foundation. Though you, my dear friends, may not accept the conclusions reached in this tract, the fact nevertheless confronts us that we must all appear before the judgement seat of Christ. He tells us by what standard we shall be judged, saying, "I judge him not, * * * * the word that I have spoken the same shall judge him in the last day." We may feel assured that if we reject his word, and make light of his commandment, his spirit does not dwell in our hearts; and in that day he will say unto us, "depart from me, I never knew you." In that day we will not be judged by what you or I may think, neither by the theology of the great and learned of the earth, but alone by that word which we now have. If that speaks us free, then we are free indeed, and shall not come into condemnation. Our opinions and our good intentions will not avail before the Lord. Therefore, we earnestly entreat all our friends to seek Jesus Christ, the true fountain of wisdom, and through love keep his commandments.

To the different organized churches of our brethren, and to those of our fellow believers scattered here and there in different parts of the country, we greet you all in the name of Jesus Christ, our common Lord and Savior, "who washed us from our sins in his own blood, and made us kings and priests unto God, and unto the Father." Dearly beloved, what love has not the Father bestowed upon us that we should be called the sons of God. Since we have been so unworthily called into this high calling, let us all earnestly strive to be faithful and obedient. There is much danger of us having only the form of godliness and be wanting the power. In the parable of the ten virgins, we have warning of the danger of cold, dead formalism. Five of the virgins had no oil in their vessels, and their lamps went out. We might have the outward form of the Christian religion, such as the profession, attendance upon the public meetings, habitual prayer, honesty in buying and selling, kindness to the poor, and yet our hearts be cold and void of love. To be a Christian, it is not only necessary to have once repented and accepted the merit and righteousness of Christ, and have experienced love to Jesus and to his people, but we must continue to grow and increase in the knowledge of ourselves, and of our Lord Jesus. If we become cold and formal in our duties, our past exercise will not help us. To be a Christian we must possess the life giving principle, which is *love*. As a test of divine love in the soul, the Apostle gives the following: "Charity suffereth

long, and is kind ; envieth not ; vaunteth not itself ; is not puffed up ; doth not behave itself unseemly ; seeketh not her own ; is not easily provoked ; thinketh no evil ; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth ; beareth all things ; endureth all things." This is a faithfully drawn likeness of love, that unfailing principle, which, if possessed by the soul, constitutes the Christian life. Since every principle of the carnal mind is antagonistic to the divine life, it is evident there will be an unceasing warfare to gain the victory over the world. In order to overcome, we must exercise ourselves in godliness, be diligent in reading and prayer, habitually engaged in spiritual conversation ; we must strive against our natural disposition, avoid unprofitable conversation, not be too eager for worldly gain, and strive for the unity and love of the church.

INDEX.

	PAGE.
UNITY, A MARK OF IDENTITY,	4
Sectarianism Without Scriptural Warrant,	8
Solomon's Temple a Figure of Unity,	12
PEACEABLE CHURCH OR KINGDOM,	19
The Two Kingdoms,	27
The Christian Defenseless,	30
Objections Answered,	35
Christ Purifying the Temple,	41
Paul's Defense,	43
WATER BAPTISM,	49
Infant Baptism,	50
Jewish Proselyte Baptism used to Support it,	62
Baptism Not Applicable to Infants,	68
The Mode of Baptism,	71
Tracing Immersion to the Apostles,	74
John's Baptism, Not Christian Baptism,	78
Baptism of Christ,	81
First Christian Baptism,	87
Baptism of the Holy Ghost by Pouring,	96
Baptism of Israel in the Sea,	100
Exposition of Rom. 6th,	103
True Import of Baptism,	107
SEPARATION FROM UNFAITHFUL WORSHIP,	116
The Inward Separation the Ground for the Outer,	120
Teachers in Sheep's Clothing,	126
Why We Separate from the Plain Churches,	132
It is said, "We Must Not Judge,"	137
SUPPLEMENT,	146
The Disciples of Christ Unconverted before Pentecost,	146
The Holy Spirit an Abiding Principle only after Pentecost,	149
CONCLUSION,	152

DUE

MHL SOUTH WING

M
230.97R2
L52ch
~~Closed~~
~~Stacks~~
26379

Lehman, Jacob S., d. 1924
The Church of Christ identified by her obedience to scriptural teaching and practice, non-resistance of evil, proper observance of ordinances, and separation from all unfaithful worship / by Jacob S. Lehman. -- [S.l. : J.S. Lehman?], 1897 (Hagerstown, Md. : Mail Pub. Co.)
155 p. ; 18 cm.

230.97R2 L52ch c.1
Lehman, Jacob S., d. 047
The Church of Christ identifie 100210
3 9310 02113388 7
MENNONITE HISTORICAL LIBRARY

M
230.97R2
L52c

InGoM 13 JAN 86 12280276 IMHLpc